

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOL. XXVIII.

BALTIMORE, JUNE, 1913.

No. 6.

ALTNORDISCH TRYGGR¹

Das altn. Adjektiv *tryggr* erscheint nur als *wa-*, *wô*-Stamm, woraus zu schliessen ist, dass das *y* aus einem früheren durch das folgende *w* (Altn. *v*-Umlaut) labialisierten *i* entstanden ist: *Urn. *triggvaR* > Altn. *tryggr*.

Die herkömmliche Ansicht, dass das *e* im Nord. und Westg. älter sei, als das *i* im Got., und dass das *e* in westg. *eo*, *eu* älter sei, als das *i* in got. *iu*, werde ich versuchen, in bezug auf das altn. *tryggr* als irrtümlich zu erweisen.

Prof. Hermann Collitz hat im *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, Bd. VI, S. 253–306 (“Segimer oder Germanische Namen in Keltischem Gewande”) die Ansicht ausgesprochen, dass es für das *i* und *iu* der germanischen Sprachen nicht den geringsten Unterschied mache, ob dem *i* ein vorgermanisches *e* oder *i* zu grunde liegt, dass es weder urg. *e* noch urg. *eu*, sondern nur vorg. *e*, *eu*=urg. *i*, *iu* gegeben habe. Alle scheinbaren Unregelmässigkeiten des Altn. und Westg. müssen aus dem Germanischen selber erklärt werden, es genüge fast immer, einfach den got. Vokalismus für die übrigen germ. Sprachen vorauszusetzen.

¹ BIBLIOGRAPHIE. Wilhelm Braune, *Gotische Grammatik*, 8. Aufl., Halle, 1912; *Zur Althochdeutschen Lautlehre. II. Die Diphthonge iu und eo (io)*, PB. Beitr. Bd. IV, S. 557–566.—Hermann Collitz, *Segimer oder Germanische Namen in Keltischem Gewande*, Journal of English and Germanic Philology, Bd. VI, 2, S. 253 ff.; *Das Schwache Präteritum und seine Vorgeschichte*, Hesperia I, Göttingen, 1912.—Falk und Torp, *Germanischer Sprachschatz*, (Fick, Wörterbuch, 4. Aufl., Bd. III, Göttingen, 1909); *Norwegisch-Dänisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Germanische Bibliothek, IVte Reihe).—Rudolph Kögel, *Gotisch ddj und Altnordisch ggj*, PB. Beitr. Bd. IX, S. 545–548.—Adolph Noreen, *Altisländische und Altnorwegische Grammatik*, 3. Aufl., Halle, 1903.—Hermann Paul, “Zur Geschichte des Germanischen Vocalismus,” PB. Beitr. Bd. VI, S. I–256.—Eduard Sievers, *Angelsächsische Grammatik*, 3. Aufl., Halle, 1898; *Zur Geschichte der Angelsächsischen Diphthonge*, PB. Beitr. Bd. XVIII, S. 411 ff.—“Zum Angelsächsischen Vocalismus,” Leipzig, 1909.—Wilhelm Streitberg, *Urgermanische Grammatik*, Heidelberg, 1892.

Über O. Bremer’s abweichende Meinung (*Indog. Forschungen*, Bd. XXVI (1909), S. S. 148–173) hat sich Prof. Collitz wieder in der Einleitung zum ersten Bande der *Hesperia* (S. XV) ausgesprochen.

Die herkömmliche Ansicht vertreten freilich noch viele, worunter Sievers (PB. Beitr. XVIII, S. 411, ff., “Zum Angelsächsischen Vocalismus,” Lpz. 1900), aber Prof. Collitz hat (Das Schwache Prät., S. 145–147) es klar gemacht, dass angels. *eo* (z. B. in *éode*, *fréond*) nichts für germ. **eu* beweist.

Was altn. *tryggr* anlangt, wird man, glaube ich, zugeben müssen, dass Prof. Collitz recht hat. Während germ. **ww* im Nord- und Ostg. als *ggw* (Altn. *ggv*) erscheint, verbindet sich im Westg. das erste **w* mit dem vorausgehenden Vokal zum Diphthong (Westg. *Wurzelvokal +*uw*). Bei dem betreffenden Worte (altn. *tryggr*) spricht das Zeugnis der westg. Sprachen zu Gunsten einer urg. Grundform mit dem Wurzelvokal *i*, nicht *e*: Urg. **tri + ww* > Westg. **triuw*. Die ahd. Formen sind im Westg. entschieden die ältesten, und zeigen daher am besten den Zustand des betreffenden Diphthongs im Westg. Die westg. Formen, deren Stamm (zuweilen mit Einschluss des anlautenden Konsonanten der Endung) auf *uw* oder *uj* (z. B. **niujis* > *niuwi*) ausgeht, zeigen im Althd. vor dem *u* ein *i* (einerlei ob aus vorg. *e* oder *i*), welches gegen ein *a* der Endung unempfindlich ist: daher heisst es nicht nur *triuwi*, *niuwi*, sondern auch *triuwa*, *hriuwa*, *hriuwan*, u.s.w. Die Endung *i* hat also im Ahd. nichts mit dem *i* (*iu*) der Stammsilbe zu tun. Nur im Ags.=Fries.=Alts. neigt altes *iu* überhaupt zum Übergang in *eo*, das wieder durch das *i* der Endung umgelautet wird. Die angeblichen alten *eu* der ältesten ahd. Quellen, die Braune² aufstellt, sind nicht streng althoch-

² “Nur in einzelnen alten Quellen sind noch Formen mit *ë* (*ëu*) bewahrt. So im Is. *hrëuðn*, und auch vor *i*, *ëuuih* (euch) und *ëu* (d. plu.), dagegen *triuwa*. Bei Tatian *trëuua* und *ëu* (euch) je einmal neben sonstigem *iu*. In H. einmal *rëuðn*; in B. einmal *ëuuih*, ebenso in al. Ps. zweimal *ëuuih* (neben *hiuuih*).” *Ahd. Gramm.*, § 30, A. 2.

deutsch, sondern "ingaevonische" (d. h. ags.=alts.=fries.) Formen. Bei diesem *ë* vor *uw* handelt es sich im Ahd. ausschliesslich um eine ags.=alts.=fries. Dialekteigenheit. Diese Formen mit ingaevonischem *ëu* versucht Braune nach dem Ags.=Alts.=Fries. zu korrigieren, welche doch eben jüngere Formen als das Althd. aufweisen. Daher halte ich (mit Prof. Collitz, der mich darauf aufmerksam machte) den von Braune (§ 30, A. 2) aufgestellten Satz nicht für richtig; nämlich ursprünglich hätten *ë* und *i* auch vor *uw* (im Westg.) mit dem Vokale der Endung gewechselt. Der beste Beweis für die Priorität des *i* vor *ë* liegt ja in den ahd. Formen selbst, die regelmässig *iu* (Westg. **iuw*) aufweisen. Ähnlich muss auch die Geschichte des alten angeblichen **eu* (Urg. **e + u*, Westg. **ë + u*) gewesen sein. Die Priorität des *i* vor *e* auch bei diesem urg. Diphthong legt Prof. Collitz in seinem Aufsatz über "Segimer" (*Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, Bd. VI, S. 253-306) klar an den Tag.

In Einklang mit der herkömmlichen Ansicht nimmt Sievers (Ags. Grammatik,³ § 46, 64. "Zum Ags. Vokalismus," S. 26-60, PB. Beitr. Bd. XVIII, S. 411-416) an, dass dem westg. Diphthong **ëu* ein germ. **e + u*, oder **e + ww* zu grunde liege, dass dieses westg. **ëu* im Ags. (Ags. Grammatik³ § 64) regelmässig als *éo* (z. B. *béod*, u. s. w.) erscheine, auch vor *w* (wo got. *iggw*, altn. *ygg(v)* vorliegt) z. B. *hréowan*, *tréow* (Altn. *hryggva*, *tryggr*). Wenn das altn. *tryggr* auf ein älteres germ. **tre + ww + a* zurückginge, wie Sievers meint, liesse sich diese Form nicht erklären, denn im Altn. ist der v-Umlaut eines *e* *ø*(ö) nicht *y*. Man wäre dann gezwungen, *tryggr* als *wja-, wjö-*-Stamm anzusehen, welcher in die *wa-, wö-*-Stämme übergetreten sei. Das *i* des Suffixes hätte das *e* der Stammsilbe zu *i* umgelautet, und letzteres wäre durch das *w* der Endung zu *y* umgelautet (d. h. labialisiert). Freilich schwanken andere Adjectiva im Altn. zwischen der reinen *wa-, wö-* und der *wja-, wjö-*-Declination (Noreen,³ § 74, 5); z. B. *dyggr*, *hryggr*, *myrkr* (Urg. *mirk + wi*), aber das *i* des Suffixes hat nichts mit dem Stammvokal zu tun, denn ein *i* der Stammsilbe bleibt gegen ein *i* der Endung unempfindlich.

Altn. *tryggr* erscheint nur als ein reiner *wa-, wö-*-Stamm (ohne *j* Suffix), sowie got. *triggws*, wie das Adverbium *triggwaba ja* zeigt. In ahd. *gi-triuwi* wird das *i* des Suffixes darauf beruhen, dass im Ahd. das *uw* (Got. *ggw*, Altn. *ggv*) wie ein alter *u* Stamm. (Braune, § 251) behandelt ist, wie, z. B. ahd. *engi*=got. *aggwus*, ahd. *herti*=got. *hardus*. Im Altn. hingegen erscheint *tryggr* nur als ein reiner *wa-, wö-*-Stamm, worin der Stammvokal *i* durch das folgende *w* des Suffixes, sowie bei *syng(v)a*, zu *y* labialisiert wird. Daher sollte man, wie Noreen (§ 74, 5) es tut, altn. *tryggr* mit got. *triggws* zusammenstellen, indem beide den germanischen Stammvokal *i* vertreten. Dass in altn. *dyggr*, *hryggr*, *myrkr*, u. s. w. *ja*, *jö*-Stämme vorliegen, verändert die Sachlage nicht im geringsten, denn ein *i* bleibt ja gegen das *i* der Endung unempfindlich. Das Altn. beweist also nichts gegen Prof. Collitz's Annahme (*J. E. Germ. Philol.*, Bd. VI, S. 253-306), dass das *i* des Got. auch dem Altn. und dem Westg. zu grunde liege. Im Gegenteil haben wir hier bei altn. *tryggr* noch eine Bekräftigung seiner Theorie, indem *tryggr*, das nur als ein reiner *wa-, wö-*-Stamm vorkommt, sich viel leichter und einfacher aus der Grundform **tri + ww + a* (Urn. **tri + ggv + a + R > Altn. tryggr*) erklären lässt, als aus einer Grundform **tre + ww + i*, wo man gezwungen ist, eine Form im Altn. (z. B. **tryggjan*) aufzustellen, die doch nirgendwo belegt ist. Auch wenn eine solche Form (nach Art von *hryggjan*) vorkäme, würde das nichts gegen altes *i* beweisen. Da nun das Got. und das Ahd. entschieden ältere Formen aufweisen, als das Ingaeponische, und da das Altn. nichts gegen altes *i* beweist, sondern entschieden für altes *i* spricht, liegt der Schluss nahe, dass nicht das Got. = Nord. = Ahd., sondern nur das jüngere Ingaeponische (d. h. Ags.=Alts.=Fries.) vom Grundvokale des Urg. abgewichen ist. Von Sievers' Standpunkte aus wäre man gezwungen, die älteren germ. Formen (Got. und Ahd.) als Abweichung von den jüngeren anzunehmen. Nach Prof. Collitz's Ansicht hingegen zeigen nur die jüngeren Formen Abweichungen von den älteren, denn hier beweisen das Altn. und das Ahd. nichts gegen das got. *i*. Hier genügt

es einfach den gotischen Vokalismus für die anderen germanischen Sprachen vorauszusetzen. In ags. *tréow* und alts. *tréuwa* liegen jüngere Entwickelungen des westg. *iu* vor.

Altn. *tryggr* beweist also nichts für altes **e + ww*, sondern stützt im Gegenteil die got. und ahd. Formen, welche auf altes **i + ww* zurückgehen. Man wird hier sagen müssen, dass das Problem am verkehrten Ende angefasst wird, wenn man die älteren Formen als Abweichung von den jüngeren ansieht, und z. B. mit Sievers und mit Falk u. Torp (Germanischer Sprachschatz, Bd. III, S. 171; Norwegisch-Dänisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch, S. 1290) got. *triggws* und altn. *tryggr* auf eine Grundform **trewwi* zurückführt. Eine Grundform **tri + ww + a* erklärt das Altn. ohne Annahme einer Suffixendung auf *j*. Bei einer Grundform **trewwi* muss man zunächst *tryggr* als *(w)ja-, (w)jō-*Stamm erklären, der in die Flexion der reinen *wa-, wō-*Stämme übergetreten sei. Warum einen solchen Umweg machen, da das *i* der Stammsilbe sich ganz gut mit dem Vokal der Endung verträgt: Urg. **tri + ww + az* > Urn. **tri + ggv + aR* > Altn. *tryggr*? Das *j* Suffix des Westg. (Ahd. *ga-triuw-i*, Alts. *getriuwi*, Ags. *getriewe*) hat nichts mit dem Nordischen zu tun, sondern beruht ausschliesslich auf westg. Eigenheiten, indem das *uw*, *uj*, u. s. w. des Westg. wie ein alter *u* Stamm behandelt und *triuw-* demgemäss in die *ja-, jō-*Declination der Adjectiva übergeführt ist.

Ferner sollte es bei Falk und Torp (Germanischer Sprachschatz, S. 171) statt Alts. *triuwi*, *tréwa* heissen *triuwi* oder *(triuui)*, *tréuwa* oder *(tréuua)*, denn die Stammsilbe ist im Heliand nach Ausweis des Metrums stets lang, hat also Diphthong.

Beim altn. Personalpronomen *yðr* sieht man gleichfalls, dass sich das altn. *i* mit einem *a* Stamm ganz gut verträgt, wenn man nämlich das Possessivum *yðarr* hinzunimmt. Hier herrschen wesentlich dieselben Vokalverhältnisse wie bei *tryggr*, denn das Got., das Altn., und das Ahd. bewahren alle das alte *i*. Nur im Ags. und im Alts. (also im Ingaevonischen) zeigt das *i* Neigung in *e* überzugehen: beim Pronomen Got. *izwis*, Altn. *yðr*, Alth. *iu*, aber Ags. *éow* (*iow*), Alts. *eu*, *iu(u)*; beim Possessivum

Got. *izwar*, Altn. *yðarr*, Althd. *iuwēr*, aber Ags. *éower* (*iower*), Alts. *euwa*, (*iuwa*). Nach der herkömmlichen Ansicht über altes *e* würde man auch hier gezwungen sein, am verkehrten Ende anzufangen, um zu beweisen, dass das Ingaevonische den älteren urgermanischen Vokal vertritt.

Bei altn. *tryggr* und *yðr* ist die Annahme des Grundvokals *i* insoweit begründet, als das *y* nichts für altes *e* beweist, sondern im Gegenteil zeigt, dass ein *i* im Altn. sich mit dem *a* der Endung vertragen kann, und als dieses *i* auch an dem Vokalismus des Got. (*triggws*) und des Ahd. (*triuwa*) eine Stütze findet. Vom geschichtlichen Standpunkte aus betrachtet, wäre es verkehrt, die urg. Grundform nach jüngeren Spracheigentümern aufzustellen, welche offenbar mit älteren Erscheinungen im Widerspruch stehen. Meine Untersuchungen über das altn. *tryggr*, (zu denen ich durch Prof. Collitz's Aufsatz über "Segimer" und persönliche Förderung seinerseits angeregt bin) haben dazu gedient, mich in der Überzeugung der Richtigkeit seiner Verneinung des alten germanischen *e* zu bekräftigen. Es lohnte sich wohl, auch andere Fälle, in denen ein westg. *iu* = altn. *y + Konsonant* (wie oben in *tryggr*, *yðr*) vorliegt, über das Gesamtgebiet des Germanischen zu verfolgen.

ALBERT MOREY STURTEVANT.

Kansas University.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE LATE LANCASHIRE WITCHES

Fleay is undoubtedly correct in his statement that this is an old play of Heywood's, revised by Brome to make it timely in its contemporary allusions, for a revival in 1634.¹ Fleay, however, has not given a very accurate determination of the parts attributable to the two authors.

The evidence which indicates that the play

¹ Fleay, *Biog. Chron.*, 1, 301.

is a revision is in the obvious interpolation of an episode, an omission of one or two incidents that we are led to expect, and a mention in two places of names of witches or spirits inconsistent with the names in the rest of the play. A transaction between Generous and Arthur, involving a mortgage, is mentioned in Act I (p. 178),² and Robin, in Act III (p. 210), gives his master Generous a receipt for one hundred pounds, which he has dropped. These two incidents seem to be connected, but not very clearly. They also ought to lead up to something, but they are hardly mentioned further. Again, in Act II (p. 197), Arthur and Shakstone bet on the speed of their dogs in chasing a hare, but the scene ends abruptly on p. 199, without the interference of witchcraft which we are led to expect. These scenes indicate that something has been omitted in the present version of the play. Moreover, the incident of the boy and the gray hounds (pp. 196, 199-201) is obviously an interpolation with no connection with any of the threads of interest. The boy is brought in again in Act V (p. 241 ff.) as a witness against the witches, but his evidence is quite unnecessary, for the *dénouement* is brought about by the soldier who sleeps in the mill. The final indication of revision is the speech of Mrs. Generous in Act IV (p. 240):

"Call Meg, and Doll, Tib, Nab, and Iug,"

and the use of three of these names, Nab, Iug, and Peg, again in Act V (p. 244). The names of the witches throughout the rest of the play are Maud (Hargrave), Meg (Johnson), Gil (Goody Dickison), Mall (Spenser), and Nan Generous; while the familiars are Suckling, Pug, and Mamilion.³

The play, then, as published in 1634, is a revision. We may dispose of the possibility of collaboration in the revision by the fact that Heywood was writing for the Queen's Company in 1633 and that the *Lancashire Witches*⁴ was brought out by the King's Men, the com-

pany for which Brome was writing in 1633 and 1634.

We are able to determine, to a certain extent, the parts that may be ascribed to each author by comparing the play with the three sources that have been discovered. The main plot, the story of a woman of wealth practicing witchcraft, finally discovered and condemned, is taken from a celebrated witch-trial in Lancashire in 1612. As ten witches were condemned and executed as the result of the trial, considerable notoriety was given to it. Heywood, with a journalist's instinct, made a play on the subject probably within a year of the trial.⁵ Besides this indication of Heywood's authorship of the main plot, the treatment of the erring wife by her husband (Act IV, p. 228) strongly suggests the *Woman Killed with Kindness*.

Closely connected with the main plot are three characters, Arthur, Shakstone, and Bantam⁶ who, in the first scene of the play, accuse Whetstone, a foolish fellow, of being a bastard. At the end of the fourth act, Whetstone has his revenge by showing, with the aid of witchcraft, visions of the fathers of the three gallants—a pedant, a tailor, and a serving man. Since this incident, as Langbaine pointed out, occurs in Heywood's *Hierarchy of Angels*,⁷ which was not published until 1635, and was, therefore, probably not known to Brome at the time of his revision, I assign the parts in which these characters occur to Heywood.

Another interest in the play is the comic situation brought about by the reversal of the relations of father and son, mother and daughter, and servant and master, as an effect of witchcraft.⁸ This part of the play, which includes the characters of Old Seely, his son Gregory, and a friend, Doughty, I can find no good reason for attributing to Brome. On the other hand, as this reversed situation has some bearing on the relation of Arthur and Generous

² T. Potts's *Discoverie of Witches in the County of Lancaster*, London, 1613 (Reprinted by the Chetham Society, 1845), gives a full account of the trial, but I do not think it was the actual source of the play. Heywood probably had merely heard of the trial.

³ See pp. 176, 189 ff., 246 ff., 250 ff.

⁴ Bk. 8, p. 512.

⁵ Pp. 179-187.

² Heywood's Works, 1873, Vol. IV.

³ See pp. 187-189, 199-202, 218-222, 235.

⁴ See title page to a *Maiden-head well Lost*, 1634, and Schelling's *List, Eliz. Drama*, 2, 586.

(pp. 178 and 182) in the main plot, it seems to me it must be assigned to Heywood.

The greater part of the rest of the play is taken up with the strange events at the marriage of Lawrence and Parnell, the servants of the Seely family. The witches play all sorts of pranks with the wedding feast and frighten the guests; and one of them, Mall Spenser, gives Lawrence a bewitched cod-piece point, which causes a great deal of vulgar comedy by preventing him from consummating his marriage. This plot is involved to such an extent with all the different interests I have mentioned before, that I cannot see any possibility of a separate authorship for it. Arthur, Bantam, Shakstone, Whetstone, Seely, Doughty, and Gregory—characters in the other plots—are present in some capacity, chiefly in the wedding scenes; Mall Spenser, who gives Lawrence the fatal present, has an intrigue with Robin, the servant who plays such an important part in the Nan Generous plot. Furthermore, there is a piece of external evidence, which, I think, indicates that the Lawrence-Parnell plot was in the early version of the play. In Field's *Woman is a Weathercock* (v. 1), one character addressing another as a very lusty person says, "O thou beyond Lawrence of Lancashire." As Field's play was entered in the Stationers' Register Nov. 23, 1611, and the trial in Lancashire, from which Heywood drew his play, was not over until Aug., 1612, Field cannot be referring to Heywood's Lawrence. However, the probability is that both dramatists are using the name of a real character well-known to the audience, or a proverbial name for a person of his type. Whichever be the case, I think it safer to infer that the allusions to Lawrence should be dated as close together as possible. An allusion of this sort twenty years old would probably be forgot. Therefore, this external evidence also points to 1613 as the date of composition of the Lawrence-Parnell plot. Fleay seems to imply that the part of Lawrence and Parnell was added by Brome, because he says that the dialect which they speak is that of the *Northern Lass*.⁹

⁹ Fleay, *op. cit.*, 1, 303.

This, however, is not true. The speech of Lawrence and Parnell, which is considered fairly good *Lancashire dialect*,¹⁰ is much more difficult for the average reader than that of Constance in the *Northern Lass*, who speaks a sort of general North English dialect.¹¹ As Heywood also had used a northern dialect elsewhere—e. g., in *Edward IV*—as well as Brome, Fleay's argument is useless.

This attribution leaves very little part in the play to Brome. I think that all that can be shown positively to be his work are the passages that are undoubtedly based on the evidence gathered at the second trial for witchcraft in Lancashire in 1633. These are the short scene of the boy and the grayhounds in Act II (pp. 196-197); the sequel to it, in which one of the grayhounds turns into Goody Dickison (pp. 199-201); the scene of the meeting of the witches (pp. 218-221);¹² and the boy's report of his adventure, at the beginning of Act V (pp. 241-244). This assigns to Brome about nine pages in all, out of a play of eighty-nine. Besides this, Brome changed the names of the witches and spirits throughout the play, and probably altered slightly the riming scene in Act IV (p. 235), to introduce the references to Meg, Mamillion, Dickison, Hargrave, and All-Saints' night. He also must have added the prologue and epilogue, and probably the song for Act II, appended to the play.

All these details of the play, just enumerated, were drawn from the *Examination of Edmund Robinson* and the *Confession of Margaret Johnson*.¹³ They must, therefore, because of their later date, have been the additions of Brome.

These interpolations have nothing to do with

¹⁰ Crossley's Intro., *op. cit.*, p. 65, n. 1.

¹¹ Compare the words listed from the two plays by Eckhardt in *Die Dialekt- und Ausländertypen des älteren englischen Dramas*, 1900, I. 86 and 87.

¹² The original idea of this scene was probably in the first version, but the getting a feast by pulling at ropes and the presence of the boy come from the 1633 version.

¹³ Both found in Crossley's introduction to T. Potts, *op. cit.*, pp. 59-76.

the rest of the play. In fact, Brome's reworking here has resulted in making a worse play out of a very poor one, merely to be up-to-date.

C. E. ANDREWS.

Amherst, Mass.

HONORÉ D'URFÉ'S *SIREINE* AND THE *DIANA* OF MONTEMAYOR

The close relations between Urfé's minor pastoral poem, *Sireine*, and Montemayor's *Diana* have often been briefly referred to by literary critics.¹ But it is only recently, in M.O.-C. Reure's excellent book *La vie et les œuvres de Honoré d'Urfé* (Paris, Plon, 1910), that this interesting question has been studied more in detail. There are, however, a few important facts which M. Reure does not mention. The present paper proposes therefore to compare the French and the Spanish pastoral once more, even at the risk of making, in parts, *double emploi* with M. Reure.

It appears from the manuscript preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale (Fr. 12486), that the *Sireine* was composed from 1596-1599, some time before the first part of the *Astrée* assumed its definite shape. The author chose for his poem a peculiar stanzaic form of six octosyllabics:

Je chante un despart amoureux,
Un exil long & malheureux,
Et le retour plein de martire.
Amour qui seul en fus l'auteur,
Laisse pour quelque temps mon cœur
Et viens sur ma langue les dire.²

¹ See esp.: Bonafous, *Étude sur l'Astrée et sur H. d'Urfé*, Paris, 1846, pp. 34 and 133 ff.; H. Koerding, *Geschichte d. frz. Romans im 17. Jhd.*, Leipzig, 1891, vol. I, p. 79; A. Lefranc, "Le roman français au XVIIe siècle" (*Revue des cours et des conférences*, Vol. XIII, 1905, p. 27). The oldest authority is probably Daniel Huet, who declares in his *Traité de l'origine des romans* (1670-72) that "Urfé a pris, . . . comme tant d'autres choses, et l'argument mesme de son Sireine de la Diana de Montemayor."

² Thus in the edition of Paris, 1618, which we follow in our quotations.

As indicated in this first stanza, the poem is divided into three parts, *le despart*, *l'absence* and *le retour de Sireine*. In the manuscript, these parts are of approximately equal length. In subsequent printed editions, however, the poem was greatly enlarged, especially the third part, which was increased to more than double its original length.³

The argument in short is as follows: Sireine, a shepherd of the kingdom of Leon in Spain, and Diane, a shepherdess, have sworn eternal fidelity to one another. But Sireine is sent away by his master, on the banks of the river Eridan. During his absence, he receives a letter from Diane, urging him to return: her mother wants her to marry Delio, a rich but uncouth shepherd. Sireine returns, but arrives too late; on the very ship that brings him home he hears that Diane, still loving only him, has fulfilled her duty as a daughter and married Delio whom she does not love. Upon his arrival Sireine meets Silvan, his friend and former rival for Diane's affection, who delivers to him a melancholy love-letter written by Diana with her own blood a few days before the marriage. At the same moment three beautiful nymphs draw near, Doride, Cynthie and Polydore, and Sireine learns from their conversation that Diane has not changed her feeling toward him, but is afraid to show her love, lest she forfeit her good name. This knowledge affords a little comfort to the unfortunate shepherd, and in the concluding stanza the author curses those who cruelly separated Sireine and Diane.

Everybody familiar with Montemayor's *Diana* will at once recognize the great similarity of our plot with the *argumento* of the Spanish novel: Montemayor resumes briefly Diana's love for Sireno, her dislike for Silvano and her final marriage with Delio, "after time and her heart had changed." He concludes: "De

³ The exact figures are:

	manuscr.	ed. of 1606	ed. of 1618
Despart.....	139 stanzas	148	149
Absence.....	122	169	170
Retour.....	142	284	284
Total.....	403	601	603

aquí comienza el primero libro y en los demás hallarán muy diversas historias de casos que verdaderamente han sucedido" . . .⁴ From this very sentence it appears that Montemayor's chief object was to develop a dramatic situation from incidents which had already occurred. Urfé, on the other hand, takes only the previous history of the *Diana*, as expounded in the *argumento*, together with a few suggestions which he finds mostly in the earlier parts of the novel. His story ends exactly at Montemayor's starting point.

The only important difference of conception between the French and the Spanish pastoral consists in the fact that Urfé's Diane marries Delio in order to obey her parents, while—according to the *argumento*—Montemayor's fickle-minded Diana simply forgets her love for Sireno.⁵ But this difference must not be overrated. The interference of cruel parents with the matrimonial projects of their children is a commonplace in the novel of that period.⁶ Montemayor himself alludes to the "voluntad de padres, persuasión de hermanos y oportunidad de parientes" which at first could not prevail upon Diana to forget her beloved Sireno, and to the "voluntad de su padre y deudos" which finally caused her to change her mind.⁷

But Urfé's imitation is not confined to general similarities in plot and characters.⁸ In certain instances he even goes as far as to directly translate the Spanish model: Out of the 149 stanzas of the *Despart*, 127 are either literally translated from, or freely enlarged

⁴ *La Diana*, Paris (Socied. de Ediciones Louis-Michaud), 1912, p. 14.

⁵ Cf. A. Lefranc, *l. c.*

⁶ See G. Reynier, *Le Roman sentimental avant l'Astrée*, Paris, 1908, ch. 10-11.

⁷ *Diana*, Book I, p. 16, and Book V, p. 223.

⁸ The three nymphs of the *Sireine* correspond exactly to the Spanish Dorida, Cintia and Polidora. If Delio is described by Montemayor as a man who, "aunque es rico de los bienes de fortuna, no lo es de la naturaleza" (*Diana*, Book I, p. 32), Urfé lets him appear as

" . . . homme imparfait

Et qu'à despit Nature a fait." (*Retour*, st. 94.) Urfé introduces new only a colorless "messager" who carries letters from and to Diane.

upon, the long *canción* of some forty *décimas* with interspersed *redondillas* in which the nymph Dorida sings of the farewell of the two lovers.⁹

A few quotations may suffice to illustrate Urfé's manner of rendering the Spanish original:

déc. 2: Este pastor se moría
por amores de Diana,
una pastora lozana
que en hermosura excedía
la naturaleza humana,
la cual jamás tuvo cosa
que en sí no fuese extremada;
pues ni pudo ser llamada
discreta por no hermosa:
ni hermosa por no avisada.

Despart st. 17: Ce berger qu'Amour devoroit
Des longtemps mourant adoroit
Des beautés la beauté plus belle.
Vne Diane estoit son cœur,
Mais la servant il eut tant d'heur
Que l'aimant il fut aimé d'elle.
st. 18: Naissant ceste fille auoit eu
Tant de beauté, tant de vertu,
Et puis deuint si parfaite
Que son nom n'eust iamais esté
Discrette, faute de beauté,
Ni belle, pour n'estre discrette.¹⁰

It will be noticed in this example that each stanza corresponds to half a *décima*, the regular proportion for the entire passage. Further-

⁹ The exact proportions of the imitation will be seen in the following figures: Not translated are *décimas* 3, 4, 5 (ll. 1-6), *redondillas* 2-3, *déc.* 26 (6-10), 27 (1-5), 30 (6-10), 41 (5-10). Original with Urfé, or freely enlarged upon the model are *sizains* 13-16 (description of the shepherd's garments, which contains reminiscences of *Diana*, Book I, p. 16), 19-23, 24-26 (threefold repetition of *déc.* 5, v. 7-10), 28-30, 33-39, 41-43, 44-49 (Sireine addresses his flocks and Mélampe, the dog which we also meet in the *Pastor Fido* and in the *Astrée*), 50-53, 58-59, 73-74, 77-78, 92-97 (enlarged upon *déc.* 23, ll. 1-5: as the letters carved into the bark of the tree are swelling, so Diana's and Sireine's love is increasing!), 103-104, 110, 116, 122-126, 129-132.

¹⁰ MS., st. 4: Ce berger mouroit adorant
ce berger adoroit mourant
des beautez la beauté plus belle . . .

MS., st. 5: Car la beauté & la vertu
auoient tellement combattu
à qui la rendroit plus parfaite . . .

more, there occur in both *sizains* rather insignificant additions which in other instances assume the character of regular *chevilles*.

Montemayor's poetical niceties, concetti and plays on words are generally preserved with obvious care. In st. 18 we admired an antithesis; here follows a conceit:

déc. 6, 1-5: *El sol por ser sobre tarde*
con su fuego no le ofende,
mas él que de amor depende
y en él su corazon arde,
mayores llamas incende.

st. 27: *Alors le Soleil qui baissoit*
Le Berger guere n'offensoit:
Mais d'Amour la chaleur plus forte
Viuante au milieu de son cœur
Par un beau soleil son vaincœur
Le brusloit bien d'une autre sorte.

Sometimes the rendering is rather clumsy, as in the following definition of absence:

Red. 1: *Al partir llama partida*
el que no sabe de amor,
mas yo le llamo un dolor
que se acaba con la vida.

St. 32: *Ceux qui ne scauent point aymer,*
Ont accoutumé de nommer
L'effet de partir une absence:
Mais moi qui suis maistre en cela
le mets le despart au delà
*De tout ce qui plus nous offence.*¹³

Quite frequently Urfé adds certain conceits which are particularly dear to him, as for instance the idea that Sireine's heart, away from Diane, needs must die, and he introduces in this connection an old Virgilian simile:

St. 36: *Ce malheur souffrir ne se peut,*
De le fuyr, Amour ne veut,
Encor'que ie m'esloigne d'elle.
Le cerf atteint fuit escarté;
Mais où qu'il aille, à son costé
*Pend tousiours la flesche mortelle.*¹⁴

¹³ MS: *Ceux qui ne scauent point aymer*
ont accoutumé de nommer
l'effait du despart despartie.
Mais moy ie dis que c'est un mal
auquel nul autre n'est esgal
qui ne finist qu'avec la vie.

¹⁴ Cf. *Aeneid* IV, ll. 69 ff., referring to Dido:

. *Qualis coniecta cerva sagitta*
 *Fuga silvas saltusque peragrat*
Dictaeos; haeret lateri letalis arundo.

This comparison was a favorite one with the poets

In the *Absence* and the *Retour de Sireine* the literal translations are much less numerous, since the little action which they contain is chiefly Urfé's own invention.¹⁵ Every now and then we meet, however, a concetto which comes directly from the *Diana*.¹⁶

Finally the question arises whether Urfé util-

of the latter part of the sixteenth century. Ronsard uses it in the first *Elégie à Genève* (*Bibl. Elzév.*, Vol. IV, p. 227), and Mathurin Regnier in his eclogue *Cloris et Philis* (*Bibl. Elz.*, p. 307).—The MS. has:

St. 31:

.
Le cerf fuit bien qu'il soit blessé,
toutefois, estant offensé,
il ne fuyt sa playe mortelle.

¹⁵ There are only two pastoral scenes in the *Diana* which could furnish further material for the *Sireine*: in book V, p. 222-223, the Spanish Selvagia defends Diana against Silvano's and Sireno's reproaches, as does the French Selvage against the accusations of the messenger (*Retour*, st. 170-188); in book VI, p. 241-253, Sireno and Silvano complain of the cruelty of Diana, while in *Retour*, st. 76-84, they discuss which one of them has been treated more cruelly.

¹⁶ *E. g., Retour*, 213 (5-6) and 214:

(Diane) sur le sable escrivoit
Du doigt: "Morte auant que changée" . . .
Mon cœur a peu croire en effect
Pour vne chose véritable
Sans que ma raison l'en desdist
Ce qu'alors vne femme dist
Et qui fut escrit sur le sable.

Diana, Book I., canción de Sireno:

St. 5: *Sobre el arena sentada*
de aquel río la ví yo
do con el dedo escribió:
"antes muerta que mudada."
Mira el amor lo que ordena,
que os viene hacer creer
cosas dichas por mujer
y escritas en el arena.

Cf. also *Astrée*, Part I, Book 4: *Madrigal qu'il ne doit point esperer d'estre aymé*, where the same thought occurs.—In *Retour*, st. 201-210, Sireine's long monologue corresponds exactly to his complaint in *Diana*, Book I, p. 16: "*¡Ay memoria mia!*" etc. Other conceits betray a strong influence of the Italian Petrarchists, as *Abs.*, st. 51: Silvano wonders why the paper of Diana's letter is not consumed by the flames which it conceals!

ized the Spanish original or Nicolas Colin's French translation of the *Diana*, first published in 1572.¹⁵ A comparison with Urfé's text shows the two translations are independent. A slight resemblance might be found in the metre of Doride's *canción*: Colin also chose *sizains*, but in heptasyllabics and with irregular alternation of masculine and feminine rimes; the *redondillas* are rendered by him in quatrains. The literary merits or demerits of both translations are almost equal;¹⁶ *chevilles* abound in Colin as well as in Urfé, only the regular stanzaic structure of the *Sireine* might perhaps be considered as an improvement.

WALTHER FISCHER.

University of Pennsylvania.

MAX HALBE

My first acquaintance with Halbe on the stage goes back to a performance of his *Strom* by a company of German barn-stormers in this country; the last opportunity to continue it was furnished by the representation of his *Ring des Gauklers* at the royal theater in Munich about a year ago. Between these two events and beginning before the first of them lay the reading of his printed plays. This is but another way

¹⁵ Through the kindness of Professor Rennert of the University of Pennsylvania, I was enabled to use his very rare copy of 1592: *La Diane de Georges de Montemayor*, etc., Tours (G. Drobet), MDXCII.

¹⁶ As a specimen of Colin's art of translation, we quote *sizains* 3-4, corresponding to *Diana*, déc. 2, and *Despart*, st. 17-18, as given above:

Ce pasteur se consumoit
Pour Diane qui passoit
En grand beauté toutes celles
Qu'on estime les plus belles,
Dont la divine facture
Fut miracle de nature.

Diane en qui nulle chose
Ne fut de nature enclose
Qui ne fust tres-singuliere,
Ne pouuant estre appellée
Peu belle ou peu aduisée,
Estant en tout la premiere.

of saying that his earlier work had stirred up a faint hope that the short list of great German dramatists was to have another name added to it. That hope was doomed to disappointment, but the interest thus aroused has by no means vanished, for, after all, Halbe has qualities which have won a place for him on the stage. Unlike some of the recent German dramatists he is never wholly trivial. He deserves respectful consideration and a good measure of appreciation.

Halbe was born at Guettland, a village of West Prussia, in 1865. He comes from a line of gentlemen farmers, but deserting the calling of his fathers, he studied at two or three German universities, emerged from his scholastic career with his Ph. D., and turned man of letters. His published works are almost entirely dramatic. Beginning with *Emporkömmling* in 1889, he has come near to producing a play annually. Two of his dramas, *Jugend* in 1893 and *Strom* in 1904, caused a genuine sensation in their day, and the latter is probably the most effective on the stage of all his work.

It still remains true that Hauptmann and Sudermann, in spite of their failure to fulfil all the hopes aroused by their earlier works, are the most potent names in contemporary German dramatic literature. The newer school has other aims, but its achievements are so far woefully disappointing. The men shaped by the forces of two or three decades ago remain the really dominant figures for the public, if not for the oncoming generation of playwrights. This explains, in part, why Halbe, who is a younger contemporary of Hauptmann and Sudermann, has won and holds a reasonably prominent place on the stage, though he has not had the luck to gain international fame.

It would have perhaps been better for him if he had been born earlier or later. He is not the great genius who forms his own public and who, though undoubtedly belonging to his own country and age, is something above and beyond them. Halbe seems rather essentially an idealist born in a naturalistic age and unable to live in harmony with his age or to go his own way in obedience to his nature's promptings. He furnishes in this regard a curious contrast

to Hauptmann, who is least himself when he forgets the world. We probably find here the explanation of Halbe's failure to bring his dramas to a really conclusive ending. He has first-rate technic and seems to know the stage well. The underlying idea is generally good, and his power of expression is not to be despised. But when the end of the play comes, we see no overwhelming reason either in the character of the persons or in the events portrayed to draw the same conclusion. This lack of motivation must lie in the clash of the poet's own nature with the literary theories according to which he proceeds. For the same reason his personages seldom seem wholly human for good or for ill. Perhaps we also find here the cause of the jarring contrast between his dialogue at its best and at its worst. The German naturalist is very apt to be merely vulgar and nasty when he prides himself most on speaking the language of actual life.

It required no gift of prophecy to be able to say that Halbe's *Ring des Gauklers* would probably score no great triumph. It falls between the two stools of seventeenth century superstition and twentieth century rationalism. Its starting point is a supposedly magic ring. Now, a modern dramatist can, of course, use the supernatural as the background or even the moving force of his drama, but he can hardly do it in other than one of two ways. He can either transport us into a world of magic where we willingly forego the ordinary rules of cause and effect or he can make a mistaken belief in the supernatural the compelling influence of the play. Halbe has done neither of these two things. He has instead given us a hero who turns rationalist at the beginning of the play after ten years of belief in a magic ring and, what is still more improbable, a heroine who becomes all self-sacrifice and devotion after quite as many years of experience as a camp follower in the Thirty Years' War. This is a fundamental matter, quite aside from other defects which make the play inferior to the best of his older work.

CHARLES HARRIS.

Western Reserve University.

NOTES ON HAUPTMANN'S ATLANTIS

Hauptmann has woven into his latest novel various experiences which he had on his journey to America in 1894, although the truth is occasionally somewhat violently twisted for personal or artistic reasons, especially in connection with the hero's relations to his wife. Hauptmann sailed for America on the ill-fated *S. S. Elbe* (Captain von Goessel) of the North German Lloyd the end of January, 1894, arriving in New York on February fourth. In *Atlantis*, Dr. Friedrich von Kammacher, the hero, sails on the *S. S. Roland* (Captain von Kessel) of the North German Lloyd, which leaves Bremen on January 23, 1892. The *Elbe* went to its watery grave on January 30, 1895, and Hauptmann's *Roland*, too, is swallowed up by the waves of the Atlantic, the graphic description of the shipwreck constituting the most striking feature of the novel. It would be interesting to know what prompted Hauptmann to select the name *Roland*, in view of the fact that a Hamburg ocean-going tug named *Roland* sank recently in the mouth of the Elbe River in the vicinity of the lightship *Elbe II*, as the result of a collision with a Danish steamer (see *Der Tag*, Berlin, January 17, 1913), more than half of the crew of the real *Roland* being lost.

Dr. Kammacher's views no doubt frequently reflect those of the author, and there are many details in which Kammacher suggests Hauptmann, although it would be foolish to go so far as to insist upon a complete identification of the author with his hero. We learn that Kammacher was the youngest son of the family, so was Gerhart; when Kammacher was sixteen years of age, he wanted to become a painter, he studied at Breslau and became a physician who specializes in bacteriology and later wishes to become a writer. Hauptmann's early vacillation between the muses of sculpture and poetry (see *Promethidenlos*) is well known; he attended an art academy in Breslau, and became deeply interested in pure science in Jena and Zürich. On his American visit Hauptmann spent some time with his friend Dr. Alfred Plötz in Meriden, Connecticut. In *Atlantis*

Plötz becomes Peter Schmidt, a physician practicing in Meriden. Schmidt is a Frisian; Plötz was born in Swinemünde. The latter's interests lie in the field of race hygiene (see Alfred Loth in "Before Dawn")¹ and similarly Dr. Schmidt discusses the problem of eugenics (*Atlantis*, pp. 239-240). While in New York Kammacher visits the studio of Bonifazius Ritter, an Austrian sculptor, whom we may identify as Karl Bitter, the well-known New York sculptor, who was born in Vienna. In Ritter's studio Kammacher makes models in clay and speaks of having watched sculptors at work in Rome—both of these things Hauptmann also did. The difficulties experienced by Hauptmann in connection with the performance of *Hannele* (see article by James Taft Hatfield in the *Twentieth Century Magazine*, 1912) are reflected in the troubles of Ingigerd Hahlström, the late Mayor Gilroy of New York becoming Ilroy, an "Irish Catholic," and Elbridge T. Gerry, president of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, becoming Mr. Barry.²

In an article on the variation in the orthography and inflection of English loanwords in German in *Modern Philology*, October, 1911, I called attention to the large number of English words in current use in German speech at the present day. *Atlantis* teems with English expressions, for which, in a great many instances, the German equivalent would have satisfied all demands. The local color is surely not improved by the addition of English expressions, especially when they are incorrectly employed, as, for example, the use of *forward!* as a translation of the German *Vorwärts!*, which in this instance should have been rendered by *go on* or its equivalent. Of course a number of English words have become part and parcel of the German vocabulary of the day, but in a great many instances the German expression or a foreign equivalent long in use need not have been

¹ Dr. Plötz is also the *Vorbild* of Dr. Rasmussen in "Gabriel Schilling's Flight."

² In my contribution to the January issue on "The Identity of The Hassenpflugs in Hauptmann's *Fool in Christ*" read Vater Vockerat for Pastor Vockerat.

avoided. Why *Readingroom* in place of *Lesezimmer*, *Steamer* in place of *Dampfer*, *Mayor* in place of *Bürgermeister*, *City Hall* in place of *Rathaus*, *Drinks* in place of *Getränke*, *Icewater* in place of *Eiswasser*, *New England States* in place of *Neu England Staaten*, *Meeting* in place of *Sitzung*, *Speech* in place of *Rede*, *Cab* in place of *Droschke*, *Office* in place of *Büro*, *Society* in place of *Gesellschaft*, *Boardinghouse* in place of *Pension*, *Newspaper* in place of *Zeitung*, etc., etc.? Some of the other words of English origin employed in *Atlantis* are the following: *Bar*, *Barkeeper*, *chartern*, *City*, *Cocktail*, *Compoundmaschine*, *Cricket*, *Dandy*, *Detektiv*, *Dollar*, *Farm*, *Farmer*, *Ferry-Boat*, *Flirt*, *flirten*, *Gentleman*, *Gig*, *Goddam(!)*, *Grog*, *Hotelboy*, *Humbug*, *interviewen*, *Jingo*, *Jockeis*, *Lift*, *Lord*, *Lunch*, *Mailcoach*, *Miss*, *Mister*, *Pier*, *Pony*, *Propeller*, *Rekord*, *Reporter*, *Revolver*, *Roastbeef*, *Sandwich*, *smart*, *das Smarte*, *Smoking* (Tuxedo), *Spleen*, *Star*, *Steward*, *Stewardess*, *das Stoppen*, *Tender*, *Tennis*, *Trainer*, *Tram*, *Tramway*, *Trick*, *Whisky*, *Yankee*.

There are also various words and expressions like *Cheers*, *high life*, *Waterspout*, *last not least*, *Upper four hundred*, *champion of the world*, *ham and eggs*, *first call for dinner*, etc., which are given in Roman type, but why not *Schinken und Eier* and *Der erste Ruf zum Essen*, since it was a German steamer?

RUDOLF TOMBO, JR.

Columbia University.

MIDDLE ENGLISH

Patience, A West Midland Poem of the Fourteenth Century. Edited with Introduction, Bibliography, Notes, and Glossary, by HARTLEY BATESON, B.A. Manchester University Press, 1912. 8vo., pp. x, 149.

It is pleasant to have an edition of *Patience* in a form for handy class-use. Yet the book before us leaves much to be desired. The editor is a young man whose enthusiasm is to be commended. But the poems of the West Midland alliterative group present many difficulties. Especially do they require a fairly wide

acquaintance not only with the large and varied Middle English vocabulary, but also with considerable Old Norse and Old French elements of the period. Besides, wide reading is necessary to solve some of the apparent puzzles in syntax, occasionally in inflectional forms, which these poems contain. Perhaps these are some of the reasons why Mr. Bateson has not succeeded so well as we might wish in a difficult task.

Mr. Bateson does not tell us explicitly the source of his text, or whether he has collated the ms., though he does imply that he has seen it. He has apparently followed Morris's second edition (1869), published by the Early English Text Society, except for a few indicated emendations. Yet in following Morris he has been unnecessarily slavish in details. He usually retains the faulty capitalization of the ms. He keeps the sign for 'and,' to the disfigurement of the page. He prints the ms. *u* (sometimes *w*) for *v*, and *v* for *u*, where there can be no question of the sound intended. He indicates by italics the expansion of the simplest abbreviations. Not one of these things is necessary even to the highest conception of sound learning, and not one of them is done by either Zupitza or Kluge in their scholarly books of selections. Besides, Mr. Bateson retains the ms. sign \mathfrak{s} for both the Middle English spirant (Modern English *gh*) and the final *s* (= *z*). Unfortunately, too, he has used for this character one wholly at variance in size with his other type, so that again the eye is unnecessarily offended. For this character, when indicating *z*, Zupitza and Kluge use that sign, and, whether one agrees with their usage or not, some differentiation between two such different sounds should be made. Inconsistently with his other practice, Mr. Bateson prints *j* for ms. *i=j*. A slighter matter is his retention of Morris's numbering of the lines in fours, with a note (p. 94) that seems to indicate that the poet had more or less fully chosen this arrangement. There is, I believe, no proof of the latter, and the numbering by fives is to be preferred.

In criticising these matters, I have less desire to find fault with this young editor than to plead for less pedantry in editing all Middle English texts. The study of Old English in schools has been greatly aided by the general practice of using modern type for the peculiar letters of the older period, and of expanding, without special indication in the print, all ordinary abbreviations. In Middle English, however, for no good reason it seems to me, the practice has too often been quite

different. I refer now, not to reprints for scholars such as those by the Early English Text and Chaucer Societies, but those for the beginner and general reader. In these, too often, there has seemed to be a special virtue in needlessly following the scribal peculiarities of a long past age. For my part I hope that such close adherence to the Middle English spelling in ordinary reading texts will become more honored in the breach than the observance.

I said Mr. Bateson had in general followed the readings of Morris. In addition to indicated emendations he has departed from Morris in the following particulars. He sometimes capitalizes proper names, though without consistency even in this. He reads *all* for *alle* (20); *destyne* for *destyné* (49); *Ninivie* with the edition of 1864 for *Nunive* (76, 95); *quoth* for *quod* (85, 205, 347, 493); *schomely* for *schomely* (128); *scape* for *schape* (160); *serlych* for *serelych* (193); *seches* with ed. of '64, and perhaps rightly, for *seches* (197); *on-slepe* for *on slepe* (200); *þy* for *þyn* (202), again a reading of the ed. of '64; *I wysse* for *Iwysse* (206); *tottered* for *totered* (233); *his* for *hit* (267); *And* for *Ande* (297); *Lord* for "Lord" (305); *entré* (ed. of '64) for *entre* (328); *trauth* for *trauthe* (336); *bar* for *bare* (374); *And* for *&* (378), with ed. of '64; *sattled* for *sattled* (409), and he makes no division at this point corresponding to Morris's part V; *þe* for *he* (411); *I-wyse* for *I-wysse* (464); *not so* for *not be so* (522). Most of these, I take it, are unintentional departures from the edition of Morris. The punctuation of the earlier edition has also been altered for the worse sometimes, and at least needs careful revision in many places.

Mr. Bateson prints his text with few emendations. He adopts Mr. G. C. Macaulay's suggestion of adding *nobel* before *poynt* in the first line, but he states his reason much too strongly when he says: "The author in his poems generally repeats the first line in the last" (p. 94). He does so in only one of the three remaining pieces, the *Sir Gawayne*. He has nothing of the sort in *Cleanness*, and he repeats but two words in *The Pearl*. Yet the reading is a good one, and perhaps to be accepted. He retains the accented *poverté* in line 13, though he quotes Luick to show that the word must be *poverte* without final *e* sounded. He emends l. 56 to read *þe[n] had [t] bowed*, where Morris emends *þe[t] had bowed*, making the clause explain *I* of the preceding line. The passage is a difficult one, especially as the first half of line 54 is not

clear. I suggest, however, the possibility of keeping Morris's reading and connecting with lines 54-56 the following line also. The general sense of the passage would then be: "If he did not make me great, and then I who had been obedient to his command had to endure trouble and displeasure for a reward, did not Jonah in Judea such a foolish thing at one time?" Perhaps also a negative *ne* has disappeared from line 56.

In rejecting Kluge's addition of *if* at the beginning of line 78 as unnecessary, it seems to me Mr. Bateson is right. In his rapid speaking Jonah does not take time to subordinate one clause to another. He names each action to be expected as it comes to his mind. On the other hand, Mr. Bateson has added *þe* before *dryglyn* quite as unnecessarily, though it occurs in Morris's first edition as if it were part of the ms. This name for deity is regularly used without the article. Mr. Bateson also rejects Zupitza's emendation of *ȝe* for *he* in line 122, though he is wrong, as was Morris, in breaking the line with a semicolon after *umbe-stounde*. Lines 121-22 merely translate *Psalm 94* (Vulgate 93), 8, and a comma only should occur after *umbe-stounde*, a semicolon at the end of the line. See my note in a forthcoming article on *Patience* in *Englische Studien*.

Mr. Bateson might well have accepted *breed-fysches* as a compound in 143. It was so printed by Kluge, and plausibly explained by Otto Ritter in *Archiv* 119, 463. He might even more readily have adopted *slepe* for ms. *selepe* in 186, as he does adopt Ekwall's proposal (*Englische Studien* 44, 165) to treat this word as the second part of a compound here and in 466. He might have made a similar compound of *honde-myȝt* in 257; cf. OE. *hand-mægen*. There can be little question that Morris's conjecture in his glossary of *wanleg* 'hopeless' for ms. *wauleȝ* (262) is correct. It is naturally a pleasure to note that this new editor has accepted my emendation *as sayled* for *assayled* of ms. and my altered punctuation of 301, a reading which clears up the whole passage. In 310 he should have adopted another conjecture of Morris's glossary, *guteres* 'gutters, water courses,' for ms. *guferes*. Mr. Bateson has the proposal in his glossary, but this was needlessly modest.

In missing the late Professor Skeat's article on "Some Rare Words in Middle English" (*Philological Society's Transactions*, '91-94, 371), Mr. Bateson has missed one of the best emendations ever proposed, *þe acces* for ms. *þacces* (325). This simple change restores the

alliteration as well as the sense, and returns another ghost word to the realms of unreality. Pretty certainly, also, one more suggestion by Morris might have been used, that of *hem* for *hym* in 331. There was no need to emend 456 by reading *mount[n]ance* instead of *mountance*; see a note on etymology of the ms. word later. In altering ms. *haf* of 460 to *hatȝ* Mr. Bateson has perhaps made an unnecessary change, since *haf he roȝt* could be read 'would he have cared.' The passage would then mean, not that Jonah ate nothing that day, but that he was so happy he might have gone without food.

The fifteen pages of Notes contain some good ones, but a few are forced and ineffective. Much more might have been done, especially by fuller comparison of word-usage and construction in other alliterative poems or in Middle English generally. Besides, Mr. Bateson has depended too much upon Ekwall's article in *Englische Studien* 44, 165, some of the conclusions in which can not be accepted. A note that seems forced is that on *under hatches* (179), where it is scarcely necessary to tell us at length that the expression is a nautical term and means 'below deck,' or to define deck and hatch. An ineffective note is that on *bap̄es* (211), where a comparison of the word in Old English, or its sense of 'immerse' in *Cleanness* 1248 and in any number of Modern English instances, would have shown that the Middle English poet has taken no unusual liberty. So the note on *Lorde* (264) is unnecessary for any reader of any part of our older literature, while it does not explain the disuse of such imprecations in polite speech. The note on *theme* (358) does not explain the orthographic variation noted in *Pearl* (944), or the modern pronunciation.

In addition to ineffective notes some might be corrected or greatly improved. Such is the one on *typed* (77), as I have shown in the article referred to above. So also the notes on the vivid description of the ship (101 f.), the subject of which I have dealt with in the same article, are at least partly incorrect. Compare especially the note on *gaderen to þe gyde-ropes* (105). For the long note on 141-44 a brief one would have sufficed, if Mr. Bateson had noted Kluge's reading *breed-fysches* already mentioned. On the accent of *feþer-beddes* (158) attention might better have been called to the modern stress of the word as compared with other compounds of *feather*. Trautmann's note in *Anglia* 18 gives no real explanation. It is difficult, too, to see how the next note on *caraldes* (159) could have been written, if Mr.

Bateson had known Ekwall's explanation in *Archiv* 119, 442 f. To this explanation Ekwall himself refers in his article on "Patience" (*Engl. Stud.* 44, 165), upon which Mr. Bateson more than once depends.

Nearly a page and a half is devoted to lines 165-67 and the names of heathen divinities. It is scarcely necessary to tell us that Tertullian is not responsible for this list of gods, since he could scarcely have known Vernagu, Mahoun, and Mergot. Nor does a telling of the story of *Roland and Vernagu* explain how the transfer of a giant's name to a heathen god was made. That it was made is natural enough. Besides, Mr. Bateson bases his note on *Mahoun & Mergot* upon Morris's marginal translation which implies that the one is the sun and the other the moon. In this I believe Morris was in error, for the last half of 167 does not necessarily explain the first half. I take it "þe mone and þe sunne" are just as much gods as "Mahoun and Mergot," the order of words in the last half-line being determined by the alliteration. In his *errata* Mr. Bateson has himself corrected his explanation of *Mergot*, citing *Margot*, a Saracen god, from *Charles the Great* (EETS. 36, 125), but he has not indicated any change in the rest of the note. Again, has he not misconceived 168, which he translates "Each sailor 'called on each man (i. e., god—lede)'"? Is it not better to make *lede* mean 'man' (here 'sailor'), not 'god,' and the subject of *vouched avowe* supplied from 165?

The note on *lodes-man* (179) should be rewritten or repunctuated so as not to say "O. E. lädmann, 'lodesman' is an altered form of 'lodeman,' etc." In 184 Mr. Bateson's acceptance of Ekwall's *hurrok*=OE. *þurruc* is unfortunate, and unnecessary as I have shown in the article already mentioned as soon to appear. Still more unfortunate is his rejection of Ekwall's explanation of *Ragnel* (188) as that of a heathen divinity, and his reading of *rag nel* "fellow will not," etc. His attempt is ingenious, but his reasoning and conclusion unsatisfactory. On *ferk* (187) might well be noted the uses of the word in *Cleanness* 133, 897, *Sir Gawayne* 1072, 1973, as well as in other writers.

A note on *haspede* (189) is almost demanded. I suggest that the first half of the line is too short and that an alliterative word is needed. The word *heved* 'head' would make sense and is perhaps as good as another. *Haspede* is then a past participle, modifying *hym*. Jonah is in the bottom of the ship when the sailor "seizes him, clasped by the head, and brought him up by the breast," etc. That

is, he first seizes him by the head and pulls him up, then clasps him about the breast and drags him on deck.

The note on *hef & hele* (219) makes unnecessary difficulty of an expression which is good sailor language now as formerly. *Heave and haul* may still be used of almost any action implying movement of sailors together. No doubt they did rise upon the oars as they dipped them in the water, and 'hauled' as they pulled against the waves. The note on *serve* (255) and the glossary do not wholly agree. Why not keep the ms. reading, and assume the meaning 'be subservient to, be in the power of'? A note on 240 should explain *unto* as governing *hym*; 'and granted unto him [to] be God.' The frequent use of the whale in medieval literature as a symbol of hell, as well as of Jonah's three days in the fish as symbolic of Christ's descent into the lower world, should have suggested a note on *swolg* (250). Ordinarily the word means 'whirlpool, abyss, pit,' but here something like 'yawning jaws, abyss (of hell).' See for the former, O.E. usage and for the latter the Wyelif Bible, *Prov.* 13, 15, as well as the references in *Bradley-Stratmann*; cf. also Jonah's words in 306.

The note on *hourlande* (270) makes unnecessary difficulty with the word. The sense of 'whirl, turn rapidly' certainly belongs to it naturally, for an examination of Skeat's *Etymological Dictionary* would have shown Swed. *hurra* 'whir, whirl about,' E. Fries. *hurrel-wind* 'whirl-wind.' The word even remained to Modern English in this sense, as in *Hakluyt's Voyages*, "For they runne hurling in heapes," quoted in the *Cent. Dict.* With this may be mentioned the noun *hurle* (319) which Mr. Bateson, following Morris and Bradley-Stratmann, glosses 'wave.' The true meaning is 'whirlpool,' and notice might have been taken of the similar line in *King Alexander* (1154):

The pure populand hurle passes it umbe.

On 406 space is wasted in discussing Morris's suggestion of *ded evil*, but Mr. Bateson rightly opposes Ekwall's idea of omitting *haf* altogether; see above under discussion of the text. On *Ermonnes* (463) might have been mentioned Chaucer's *Ermonny* in *Anelida* 72. As a last suggestion, should not *for madde* be read as a compound in 509, with the meaning 'very foolish'? This keeps the adjective use of *madde*, as otherwise in Old and Middle English, and makes smoother the connection with the next line.

Mr. Bateson's glossary needs revision in many particulars. It does not contain quite

all the words, it explains some of them incorrectly, and it is often faulty in its derivations. For example, the following entries are omitted entirely. *A, an, art.* 'a, an.' *Acces, sb.* 'approach, attack, access' from OF. *acces*, made necessary by Professor Skeat's emendation of 325. *Bulk, sb.* 'cargo, hold,' 292. *For-bi*, put under *for*, and *fully* put under *ful* deserve separate places. *Lof, sb.* 'love,' 448. *Losse, sb.* 'loss, ruin, destruction,' 174. *Nagt, sb.*, placed under *nigt*, should have separate entry with explanation of form. *Spakly, adv.* 'quickly,' 338. *Syde, adj.*, 'wide,' 353. *Wropeloker, adv.* comp. of *wropelik* 'wrathfully, angrily,' 132, and *wropely, adv.* 'angrily, ill' of the same line. In addition, the forms *blosched* (343), *boute* (523), *by* (117), *bylyve* (224), *cowþe* (5, 421), *gowd* (286), *þink* (332), *sor* (507), should be entered with cross references to *blusch, bot, be, bilyve, can, gode, sorge, pyng*. *Blober* should have been referred to *bluber*, the first of the forms to occur and the better for the principal place in the glossary. On phonetic grounds initial þ deserves a separate position, rather than a place under *t*.

Under meanings may be noted a number of corrections and additions. Such extensive use of alliteration as the poem shows leads to a considerable modification of ordinary meanings. It would be better, therefore, to give the ordinary meaning of the word first, and then the derived use in the particular case. At least any reliance on the contextual sense alone is likely to lead to error. Under *abyde* add 'endure' for 7, 70. *Ascry* means 'cry out upon,' rather than 'call upon' in 195. *Baft* is sb., not adv., as Morris seems to imply by citing OE. *bafta* 'after part, back' in derivation. *Bidde* (51) does not mean 'bide, wait,' but belongs under the preceding entry, *bidde* 'order, bid, command.' *Blo* means 'dark blue, black,' 'livid' perhaps but not 'pale.' 'Pale waters' would hardly be appropriate to a storm, and 'pale' is not the meaning of ON. *blár*. *Blober* (*bluber*) means 'bubbling, boiling, surging.' It is difficult to believe that *blunt* (272) means 'rushed.' *Jonah* is 'reeling' into the whale's gullet, 'whirling about heels over head,' until he 'blunders, or staggers' 'into a space as broad as a hall,' see the entry in Bradley-Stratmann. Or possibly the word may be a weak verb derived from OE. *blinnen*—*blan* 'cease, come to a stop.' *Broþely* means rather 'quickly' than 'violently' in 474, and this is the sense of the ON. adv. *brāþlīga*. The two words *bur* should be placed together with meanings 'strong wind, blow, assault.' *Busy* (157) is adj. used as sb., hence 'activity, bustle, haste.'

Under *can* should be placed *cowþe* (5, 421), and 'know how to' should precede 'be able' for the meaning. In glossing *cowþe* as adj. Mr. Bateson shows he has mistaken both meaning and syntax. *Carald* means 'cask, keg,' as Ekwall showed in *Archiv* 119:442 ff. *Con=gon* (10) is correct enough, but the meaning 'gan, did' should be added. *Dase* (383) means 'grow dizzy, or numb.' *Deme* means 'judge, deem,' then 'decree.' *Derfly* means 'boldly, bravely,' not 'quickly.' *Drege* should have the added meaning 'suffer to the end, carry through.' *Drye* (338) adj. is here used as a sb. 'dry land,' cf. *Cleanness* 472 with its variant of the word, *druye*. Here *spare drye* translate the Vulgate in *aridam*; see later upon *spare*. *Drygylch* is 'incessantly, continually,' with emphasis upon the meaning of OE. *dréogan*. Miss E. M. Wright has called attention to this meaning of the word in *Sir Gawayne* 1026, *Cleanness* 476; see her "Notes on Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight," *Engl. Stud.* 36, 209. Cf. also *drege* above. *Dumpe* (362) means 'fall, tumble,' rather than 'drive,' cf. Dan. *dumpa*. Morris's rendering of *fale* (92), followed by Bateson in his 'true, faithful,' seems to me to miss the point. Is it not just the opposite idea 'careless of, hostile to'? Can we have here a form of OE. *fæle* (*felo*) 'fell, hostile to' (cf. *el-fæle*, *Andreas* 771), or perhaps better OF. *fel* (*fail, fal*) 'unmerciful.' *Farandly* 'pleasantly' might better be 'complacently.' *Feche* (58) means 'bring to or upon,' rather than 'seek, take,' for *unsounde he hym feches* means 'evil (misfortune) he brings upon himself'; cf. Morris's rendering of *unsounde*.

Forwroȝt (163) needs a stronger meaning than 'laboured, weary,' such as 'worn out, exhausted.' *Founde* (126) means 'seek to find, hasten,' the latter an OE. meaning and suiting exactly. In my forthcoming article in *Engl. Stud.*, I have proposed to divide *glaymande* (269) into *glaym* sb. and *ande* conj. For the sb. *glaym* cf. *gleyme* or *rewme* 'reuma' in *Prompt. Parv.* *Godly* is adj. 'good, goodly,' not adv. 'well.' *Grame* (53) should have 'trouble' as a secondary meaning, again an OE. sense of the word. *Happen* (11) means 'fortunate, blessed.' 'Happy' is too weak for a place in the beatitudes. On *haspede* see my note above. Does not *haþel* (228) mean 'nobility,' the abstract from the concrete meaning?

Mr. Bateson places *hellen* (306) as "gen." under *hell*, apparently not having noticed the Maetzner, Bradley-Stratmann *hellen* adj. At least some note on the form should have been given. For *hitte* 'hit upon, meet with, find' would keep nearer to ON. *hitta*. *Hurrok* I be-

lieve I have better explained in the article already referred to. *Hygt* (219) means 'hope,' OE. *hyht*, not 'height' in spite of Morris's rendering. Had Mr. Bateson seen this his note on the line need not have been written. *Joyne* (62) means 'enjoin, appoint,' not 'add, appoint.' *Lechche* means 'catch, seize, reach for,' and *lach out* (425) 'snatch away,' a stronger expression than 'take away.' *Lance* is 'utter, declare,' not 'take;' cf. the modern parallel in the doublet *launch out* for vigorous expression on a subject. *Lave* (154) means 'lade out, bail out,' not 'pour out;' cf. examples in *NED.* or *Cent. Dict.*

Under *lay* (two words) and *layde* Mr. Bateson has made some curious errors. *Lys* (458) is indic. 3 sg. of *lyȝe* (*lyge*) stv., OE. *licgan*; cf. *Pearl* and *Sir Gawayne* for other forms. *Lyggede* presents difficulties. To avoid them Kölbing in *Germania* 20, 369-70 proposed to read *lyggende* pres. part., assuming the macron over *e* had been omitted, but apparently not considering that the pres. part. would be *lyggande*. If made a weak pret., as by most authorities, it probably belongs to a pres. *lygge* from ON. *liggja* 'lie.' *Layden* (106) can not be 'load' from OE. *hlādan*, but is pret. pl. to *lay*, as Kluge gives it in his *Mittelenglisches Lesebuch* under *legen*. Cf. also Skeat's *Etymological Dict.* under *larboard* for meaning, as better than Kluge's 'stiessen ab (d. schiff).' *Layk* (401) is used too seriously to mean 'sport,' and is rather 'exercise, activity.' *Lede* (428) is 'lead, carry, be a messenger of,' meanings handed down from OE. usage. *Lede* 'man' is also 'prince, god,' for 281.

Lode (504) means 'leading, guiding,' rather than 'path, course' which, with 'burden, load,' belong to the second *lode*. *Loȝe* (230) means 'water, lake, sea,' not 'depth' which would not do for *Cleanness* 336, 441, 1031. *Losynger* means 'deceiver, traitor,' stronger and nearer the original sense than 'liar.' *Lot, lote* might be glossed together, since they spring from the same ON. *lāt*, with the meanings of the two words Mr. Bateson gives. To the meaning 'sound' should be added 'howling, uproar.' *Lovne* (173) means 'offer, propose,' rather than 'advise,' the advice here being in the proposal as a whole; cf. English dialectal *lofe, loave*. For *lur* (419) the meaning 'misfortune, evil' should be given. To *lurkke* should be added the meanings 'move about stealthily, peer about,' cf. Norw. *lurka* 'sneak away,' MHG. *lūren* 'examine.' For 'peer furtively or slyly' see *Towneley Myst.* xxix, 107. To *lyȝtly* 'easily' should be added 'quickly' for 88, not 'perchance.' *Lyȝtloker* adv. means

'easier, more profitable' in 47, not 'sooner.' The meaning of *merciable* is 'having mercy, merciful' in 238, not 'venerable.' Mr. Bateson has been misled by supposing that the poet is translating literally Tertullian's *venerando Domino*. But alliteration requires an *m*-word, as *Moyses* in the last half-line was doubtless already in mind. The gloss of *mote* 'abode' would suit all places in the poems better if it were 'moat, castle, dwelling-place.' The meaning 'nose' for *nos* (451) is inadequate without further explanation. A modern architectural use of nose 'a downward projection or cornice to throw off rain water' gives a hint, and perhaps 'projection for protection, opening' are best. An opening on the north, as shielded from the sun, would be most appropriate, though there is nothing in the original on which this idea is based.

Note (220) means 'use, occupation, labor,' rather than 'device, advantage.' The meaning 'inflame' for *on-hit*, suggested by Morris who thought the word might be from OE. *onhātan*, is not probable. ME. *anhitten* 'hit, strike' is found elsewhere; cf. Maetzner who places *anhitten* and this *on-hit* together. *Play* 'play' should have a second meaning 'exercise oneself.' *Playn* sb. should be adj. 'plain, even, clear of' for 439. The line means "For it was clear in that place of (for=in respect to, as to) bending groves;" that is briefly "there were no groves for shade." *Poplande* means 'bubbling, boiling, surging' rather than 'rushing'; cf. *popple* 'bubble, boil, toss up' in Wright's *English Dialect Dictionary*. *Pure* (319) is certainly inadequately glossed by 'pure.' Is it not rather an adv. 'wholly, completely,' perhaps 'briskly, fiercely' here as modifying *poplande*, not *hurle*; cf. *pure litille* 'very little' in *Mandeville*, *pure selde* 'very seldom' in *Piers Plowman* (C) viii, 20, *pure suffrant* 'wholly tolerant' in Chaucer's *Book of the Duchess* 1010. For *pyne* (423) perhaps 'penance' should be added. The long gloss on *rag* disappears with the retention of *Ragnel* in the text; see note above.

Ramelande (279), like *glaymande* (198), should be separated, I believe, into *ramel* 'refuse,' and *ande* 'and'; see note on *glaymande* above. *Reme* means 'cry out, bewail, lament for.' *Renay* (344) means 'renounce, abandon.' *Ronk* sb. (298) is merely the adj. so used, as often in these poems. *Rops* should be given *rop* (270), there being no special reason for citing the plural here. *Rych* (136) should be 'powerful, rich,' the first being the probable sense in the passage. *Sake* (84, 172) should have the stronger meaning 'fault, guilt.'

Schape (160, 247) means 'take shape, form, shape,' not 'appoint, shape.' *Sege* (93) is 'seat, throne,' not 'siege' now obsolete in this sense. To the meaning of *selly* add 'wondrous' for 1. 353. On *serve* (235) see note above. *Schage* means only 'a stalk with leaves,' translating *hedera* of the *Vulgate*. 'Wood, thicket' would be impossible in the connection; cf. 439-40, *bynde* (444), *wodbynde* (474), and especially 479-80. Is not *soghe* (67), which Morris first glossed 'sow,' to be placed with *soghe* 'moan, sough as wind' with the added meaning 'cry in mournful manner,' as in proclaiming a message of evil? As to *sorge* (275) I agree with Ekwall (*Engl. Stud.* 44, 171) that we should have a word meaning 'filth, pollution,' and I think the word should be so glossed. In addition to the Scandinavian words he cites I would compare ON. *saurgan* 'pollution, defilement,' *saurigr* 'filthy, foul.' Some connection with these words seems more than probable.

Spare 'spar' (338) should disappear, as the word is nothing but the adj. below. *Spare drye* translates the *Vulgate* *in aridam*, with *spare* in sense of 'waste, empty,' which should be added to 'thin, spare' under the adjective. *Sput* should have suggested 'spout' before 'spit' or in place of it. *Stape-fole* 'high' (122) should disappear as a compound, as I have noted above. *Stape* adj. should remain, glossed 'steep, excessive, great.' *Stele* means 'upright of a ladder,' not 'step' or 'rung'; it is from OE. *stela* 'stalk, support'; cf. Skeat, "Rare Words in Middle English" (*Transactions of Phil. Soc.* '91-94). It is thus, as Professor Skeat points out, that there is apt contrast in *betwene þe stèle and þe stayre*. *Styggle* (402) means 'order, ordain,' as well as 'arrange,' which is not so suitable to the passage. *Swenge* means 'swing, move rapidly, dash,' not 'waft, toss.' For *swayve*, 'glide, move swiftly' are better than 'swim.' *Swey* should have 'bow, bend, sway, swing' instead of the colorless 'walk.' On *swolge* 'gullet, yawning gulf,' see note above. Ought not *teme* (37), which Mr. Bateson glosses 'team,' to be placed under *teme* 'theme'? With *in teme layde* (37) cf. *Pearl* (944), *in theme con take*, with much the same sense. *Teme*, wkv. should be glossed 'attend upon, minister,' rather than 'lead, approach'; see my article above mentioned.

Pacce must disappear after what has already been noted on *acces* above. *þat* (118) should be put under *þat* rel. pro., and "Rel. pro. 411" under *þe* should disappear; the ms. reads *he*. *pikke* (6) is an adv. meaning 'more frequently.' *þret* (267) is 'vexation, violence, ill-treatment,' as *þrat* above. *þro* means 'struggle, stubborn

resistance,' which should precede 'impatience.' To *tryste* should be added 'trust.' *Unsounde* (58, 527) is sb., not adv., and means 'misfortune, evil,' cf. Morris's glossary. *Unwar* is 'unwary, incautious,' then 'foolish.' *Venym* (71) means 'malice, evil,' as in Chaucer and often, not 'filth.' *Wale* should have 'distinguish' added to 'choose' for 511. *Wamel* (300) means 'be nauseated, be faint or sick,' as in Wright's *Dial. Dict.* If applied to food in the stomach 'roll' would be quite appropriate, but here the whale itself is the subject. *Warpe* 'throw out' comes to mean 'utter' as *kest* 'cast' above, and the original meaning should be recognized in each case. *Waymot* means 'angry' in 492. *Wayne* is 'obtain, provide, procure,' translating the *Vulgate* *paravit* of *Jonah* 4, 7, and 'send' is not a correct meaning. *Wayte* means 'watch, observe, look after' as well as 'search.' *Wo* is adj. 'woful, evil' in 317. *Won* means 'dwelling-place' hence 'city' in 69, for which Mr. Bateson's 'dwelling' will not suit.

Derivation becomes especially important for the words of alliterative verse, because of the variation from ordinary sense which the poet allowed himself in order to fit his alliterative scheme. I shall therefore call special attention to this matter in Mr. Bateson's vocabulary, suggesting also that he has much to learn in the application of phonetic principles. For example, under *abyme* OF. *abime* as well as *abisme* should be cited for obvious reasons. So under *ame* should be placed *asme* (*aime*), both of which are nearer than OF. *esme*. From either of them the English word is a possible derivative. *Ascape* comes from NF. *escaper*, not OF. *eschaper*. *Aslypped* is from OE. *slyppan* with prefixed *a* *an* (*and*), not from OE. (*tō*)*slipan*. For *balter*, Björkman (*Scandinavian Loan-Words in Middle English*) gives Dan. *boltre*, Dan. dial. *baltre*. *Bogted* comes from ON. *bugt* 'bending, bowing, arch,' connected with OE. *būgan* 'bend'; cf. OE. *byht*, and Spenser's *bought* 'serpent's coil.'

Both words *bur* are derived from ON. *byrr*, the vowel being due to the influence of *r* as in many other words; cf. Knigge, *Die Sprache des Dichters von Sir Gawain*, etc. Under *chawl* the OM. form should be *cafl*. For *derfly* it might have been noted that already in Old Northumbrian *dearf* is found. *Dedayn*, *desert*, *devoyde* are from OF. forms in which *des-* had become *de-*. *Dore* is from OE. *dor*, not *duru*. There should be some explanation of how *dote* and OF. *redoter*, not *radoter*, are connected if at all. For *drowne* a Scandinavian **drugna* < *drunkna* is to be cited; cf. Björkman. *Drys-*

lych can not come directly from ON. *drjugr*, and a form based on the root of OE. *dréogan* is probable. *Dust* is from OE. *düst* by shortening.

Of *fasten* OE. *fastnian* is the direct source. *Farde* is from OM. **férde*; cf. MLG. *(ge)värde*, but *fertu*, *fyrtu* are impossible. Mr. Bateson follows Maetzner in assuming *flem* is a dialectal form of OF. *flum*. This seems to me unlikely and I propose OE. *flēam* 'flight,' perhaps 'rushing movement, as of water,' cf. ON. *flaumr* 'an eddy,' *flaumosi* 'rushing as of torrent.' From such an OE. form ME. *flēm* (*flem*, *flim*) are easily possible. Björkman does not support the derivation of *happe* from OE. *gehæp*, but insists on Scandinavian origin. *Happen*, adj., from ON. *heppinn*, has been influenced by *hap*, sb., *happen*, vb., ON. *happa*. For *heter*, MLG. *hetter* is better than MHG. *hette*. Wall's suggestion of ON. *heitr* is scarcely to be considered. *Holde* is from OM. *haldan*, *hāldan*, WS. *healdan*.

Joyleg has nothing to do directly with OE. *-lēas*, and ME. *-les(s)* should have been given for the suffix. *Joyne*, as its meaning shows, is probably from OF. *(en)joindre*. *Jude* is from the OF. form of the name, rather than Lat. *Judea*. *Kever* is AN. *(re)cēvrir*, OF. *(re)cōvrir* (*cuevrir*) by shortening. *Kyþ* is OE. *cyð*, not *cyð(ðe)*. For *lad* reference might well have been made to Bradley's explanation (*Athen.*, June 1, 1894) as perhaps connected with the vb. *ledan*-*ledde* (*ladde*) and meaning 'one led,' that is 'servant.' In citing an OM. form, as under *hlāge* 'laugh,' the WS. equivalent should be given for comparison. Under *laste*, sb. O. Swed. *last*, *lasta* should have been put beside ON. *löstr*. With the explanation in note above of *lede*, wkv., the need for connecting it with ON. *hljōþa*, *hljōþ*, as Knigge had done, disappears. *Lene* is OE. *lēnan*, not ON. *lēna*. For *leþe*, vb., Mr. Bateson should have said cf. ON. *līpa*, for the ME. vb. must come from an OE. **læðan*, causative to a **līðan*. Similarly *leþe*, sb. must be a mutated form of the **læð* root allied to *līðe* 'mild.' *Leve* is from OM. *(ge)lēvan*, WS. *(ge)lievan*. The first *lode* is from OE. *(ge)lād*.

Mountance, not *mountnance* as Mr. Bateson incorrectly emends, is AN. *māntance*, OF. *mōntance* 'amount.' Under *nok* it would seem as if Mr. Bateson had misread Skeat. At least the latter suggests in his latest revision of the *Dict.* that Ir. and Gaelic *niuk* may be from Low Scotch *neuk*. He then conjectures an OE. **noc*, with which he compares Norw. *nakke* 'corner cut off.' *Non* is OE. *ne + ān*. *On-round* is made up of OE. *on-* and AN. *rūnd*, OF. *rōnd*.

Payne, vb., for which no source is given, is OF. *peiner* (*painer*). *Pyne*, vb. is OE. *pennian* 'fasten with a pin.' *Quikken* comes from ON. *kvikna*. *Quoyn* is OF. *quoint*, *coint*. *Rak* is OE. *racu*. *Reme* is OM. *hrēman*, WS. *hrēman*. *Route* is OE. *hrūtan* 'snore,' not ON. *rauta* 'roar.' With *runyschly* might have been compared *renyschly* 'fiercely' of *Cleanness* 1724. Under *scapel* cf. ON. *skapi* 'harm,' but delete OE. *scapel*, which if it had existed would have given *schapel*. Under *schage* the OE. form should be *sceaga*. The OE. form of *schape* might be **sceapian*, not found, but not *scapan*. The ME. vb. is a new formation from the noun, or possibly a modification of an old weak verb.

It is difficult to understand Mr. Bateson's OE. *scāmlīce* as the original of *schomely*. He can hardly suppose *o* long in ME., while *scāmlīce* could hardly be a misprint for *sceamlice*, the true form. *Stele* is OE. *stela*, not *stel*; see note above. *Styggle* is an *l*-formation based on OE. *stihtan*. The original of *swefte* is OE. *swifte*, not *swefte*, possibly a misprint. *Swelme* doubtless comes from an unrecorded OE. **swælm* from OE. *swalan* 'burn.' *Swenge*, wkv., is from OE. *swengan*, as its meaning and forms show, not the strong *swingan*. The derivation of the two verbs *swepe* is asserted too confidently, to say the least. With *swolge*, sb., should be compared Dan. *swalg* 'gullet, gulf, whirlpool.' Under *swowe*, OE. *swōwan* should be *swōgan*. The source of *teme*, wkv., is ON. *tēma*, not OE. *tēman*, as shown above.

The form from which *pikke* comes is ON. *pikkr*. For *þreng* presumably Mr. Bateson means to cite ON. *þrengja*, a late form of *þrōngva*, but see Björkman (as above) p. 157. *Pro* is from the ON. sb. *þrā*, not the adj. *þrār*. *Torne* may be directly from OF. *torner*. *Towe*, wkv., can not come directly from OE. *tēon*. For *tramme* no satisfactory etymology has been found, but possibly it is from ON. *trafn*, *trann*, 'beam' referring to the mast; cf. the fuller discussion in my article for *Engl. Stud.*, mentioned above. For *truly*, OE. *trēowlīce* is the natural source. The OE. form from which *tulte* may come is *tealtian*, not *tieltan*, but both *tulte* and *tylte* are possibly Scandinavian; cf. Swed. *tulta*, Norw. *tylta*, ON. *tolta*. *Unsounde* is a sb. from OE. *un-* and *(ge)sund*. *Walter*, wkv., can be ON. *velta* only indirectly as the latter is strong, but may be from the same root influenced by the sb. *valtr* 'a rolling'; cf. *wale* and the ON. sb. *val*. On *wauleg* see emendation above. *Waymot* is OE. *wēamod* 'angry,' with unvoiced final consonant and the first part influenced by ON. *vei*. *Welde* is not from OE. *wealdan*, stv., but from a weak derivative; cf.

OE. *geweldan* with lengthened vowel, and see Kluge-Lutz, *English Etymology*. *Welwe* is probably from a mutated form of the root appearing in OE. *wealwian* 'fade.'

I can not leave this glossary without expressing the belief that quantities of the long vowels should have been marked, and the quality of long *e*'s and *o*'s. With one or two exceptions, also, proper names are not given, an omission too common in glossaries of all kinds.

Mr. Bateson's Introduction has been left to the last to emphasize the great importance which I think should now attach to well-edited texts of these little-known poems. When they have been thoroughly edited and studied in detail, we may be able to approach the writer's life and purposes more fully. As to these, it seems to me, Mr. Bateson has not added much to our knowledge. He devotes thirty-two pages to the date of the poems, following the divisions "Relative Date" and "Positive Date" of Miss Thomas's dissertation on Sir Gawayne, eight pages to Dialect, Language and Manuscript, fourteen pages to Subject Matter and Sources, eight pages to a Hypothetical Sketch of the Poet, and six pages to two appendixes. The discussion of date has added little to what was known, and all we do know might have been put into a few paragraphs. The hypothetical sketch of the poet might have been considerably reduced by a frank admission that we know little of the externals of his life. Such reduction would have left space for an adequate discussion of the poet's power in expression, and of his art in using this quaint old form of verse.

It seems to me, also, that we might have expected some fuller treatment of the language of the poem. It is more than a quarter century since the studies of Knigge and Schwahn, and nearly half a century since the admirable work of Morris. At least such treatment of the language as would have assisted the reader was essential, and this has by no means been given. The best portion of the Introduction is that dealing with the subject-matter of the poem and its sources. Perhaps it might be thought the writer is partial to the latter because Mr. Bateson accepts the dependence of parts of *Patience* upon the pseudo-Tertullian *De Jona*, a dependence which I pointed out in the tenth volume of the *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*. Mr. Bateson's independent discovery and use of this source would seem to confirm the idea, in spite of a recent expression of skepticism by an *Athenaeum* reviewer of Bateson (Oct. 26, 1912).

In exhibiting the parallelism between parts

of *Patience* and the *De Jona*, Mr. Bateson might have made more of the *De Jona*—*Patience* treatment and the Vulgate, the original source. The table, too, showing the dependence of other parts of *Patience* upon the Vulgate might have been considerably extended either in Introduction or Notes. Thus, in lines 15–18 the poet follows the Vulgate order of the beatitudes, placing "the meek" before "those that mourn." So in the prayer of Jonah from the whale's belly,

Lorde, to þe haf I cleped in careg ful stronge,

translates very closely "clamavi de tribulacione mea ad Dominum." In 307 "and þou knew myn uncler steven" translates "exaudisti (heard from a distance, so not clearly) vocem meam." So the next line,

Þou diptes me of þe depe se into þe dymme hert,

is the Vulgate "et projecisti me in profundum in corde maris." Again the poet used "and" in 322 to correspond with Lat. "et," where we should expect "yet or but." It is one of a good many examples indicating that a disjunctive meaning of OE., ME. *and* should be more clearly recognized. So also "her mercy" (332) translates "misericordiam suam" 'mercy of or for themselves,' showing that the *her* is used in an objective sense.

A similar parallelism of expression might have been noted through the remainder of the poem, while a close reading of the Vulgate would also have revealed the poet's originality in his departures from his source. Thus lines 73–88 are based on nothing in the Bible, though perhaps suggested by lines 15–18 of the *De Jona*. The curious elaboration of the conversion of the sailors (237–340 compared with 164–68) calls for a note. It is based, it is true, upon *Jonah* 1, 5, "et clamaverunt viri ad deum suum," compared with *Jonah* 1, 14, "et clamaverunt ad Dominum." Yet the transformation of the sailors from heathen shrews into good Israelites of the old dispensation, to sacrifice and make vows "on Moyses wyse," and to accept Jehovah as the true God, is wholly the work of the English poet. So the vividness of the poem in lines 341–348, especially the making of Jonah land at Nineveh, as well as the question of the Lord and the answer of Jonah, are based on nothing in the Vulgate. These are at least a few points in which the Introduction to this interesting poem might be improved.

The misprints in the book are far too many, even for a first edition. Mr. Bateson has corrected a few. I summarize others as follows.

In the forty-three lines of English poems quoted between pages 8 to 26 there are twenty-three typographical errors. In the fifty-two lines or part lines of English and Latin verse in pages 44 to 50 there are sixteen errors, eleven in the twenty-six Latin lines. On p. 53, in sixteen lines or part lines from *Patience* itself, there are seventeen misprints. Some other misprints of the Introduction follow in detail. P. 13, fifth line from bottom, read Cleanness 116-117. P. 15, ninth l. from bottom, read l. 120. P. 21, l. 13, at end, read denuncia-. P. 51, l. 6, moreover for "however" would be truer to fact. Last line, read Oeniponte. P. 76, last l., should ms. be placed before the reading? P. 104, l. 4 from bottom, read domino . . . venerando, not *venerando deo*.

Misprints in glossary. P. 110, under *Abyde* read *abyde* 70; under *And*, read 322 for 522; under *Anon*, read *an + än*. P. 111, under *Ask* read *äscian*(äcsian); under *Balter*, read 459. P. 112, under *Bite*, read *wk.* for *kw.*; so *Blok* for *Bloc*. P. 114, under *Busche* read onomatopoetic. P. 115, under *Can*, read *cunen* 513, not *cunnen*; under *Con*, read *gon*, not *gon*, or if intended for meaning, *gan*. P. 117, under *Dumpe*, read *fall*; so *Dyngne* for *Dynge*. P. 118, under *Enmye*, read *OF. enemis*. P. 122, under *Haspe* read *OE. hæpsian*; under *Haspede*, read *OE. hæpse*. P. 123, under *Herk*, sign for "from" is reversed. P. 124, under *Hitte*, read 289. P. 125, *I.wysse*, should be *Iwysse*; under *Ilyche*, read *ever-ilyche*. P. 128, after *Hygtloker*, add *adv.* P. 131, under *Navel* read *OE. nafela*. P. 132, under *Pitosly*, read *OF. piteus + ME. ly*. P. 133, under *Poplande*, read *Du. popelen* = *bubble*. P. 134, read *Rakel*, not *Rakle*. P. 139, under *Sorge* read 507 for 509; under *Stayre*, read *round* for *rund*. P. 145, read *Upynyoun* for *Upynoun*.

OLIVER FARRAR EMERSON.

Western Reserve University.

Autour de Flaubert, par RENÉ DESCHARMES et RENÉ DUMESNIL. Paris: Mercure de France, 1912. 2 vols., 349 and 352 pp.

Les mânes de Gustave Flaubert ne doivent pas être contents. Lui qui avait en horreur tout ce qui sentait la réclame, qui disait: "L'idée de la publicité me paralyse," qui, s'indignant à la pensée qu'on écrivit sa biographie, s'écriait:

L'écrivain ne doit laisser de lui que ses œuvres. Sa vie importe peu. Arrière la guenille!

le voilà en ces derniers temps livré, et par ses admirateurs, aux curiosités du public bourgeois qu'il appelait avec mépris "messieurs les épiciers, vérificateurs d'enregistrement, commis de la douane, bottiers en chambre et autres." Depuis quelques années, les articles sur lui, sa vie, ses amitiés, sa maladie, ses correspondantes, abondent dans les revues; on en a même tiré la matière de deux ou trois thèses de doctorat. Cet intérêt général s'accentua considérablement à l'apparition d'une édition nouvelle des *Œuvres complètes de Flaubert*,¹ laquelle, si elle ne mérite pas pleinement le titre de définitive qu'elle se décerne, et si les notes qu'on y a ajoutées sont souvent plus curieuses que critiques, rend accessibles, du moins, nombre de lettres et de documents restés jusqu'ici enfermés dans les archives de la Villa Tanit.

Une des plus récentes publications sur le grand romancier est un ouvrage en deux volumes dû aux actives recherches de MM. Descharmes et Dumesnil, bien connus comme flaubertiens. C'est un recueil de neuf articles, presque tous déjà parus en diverses revues depuis 1909. Anecdotiques plutôt que critiques, ils concernent principalement la vie littéraire de Flaubert et les circonstances de la composition et de la publication de ses ouvrages, depuis la première apparition de *Madame Bovary* en 1856 jusqu'à sa mort, vingt-quatre ans plus tard.

Découragés, semble-t-il, par tout ce qu'on avait déjà publié sur leur écrivain au point de vue littéraire, les auteurs de ces études disent avoir renoncé à l'idée d'aborder la critique proprement dite de ses œuvres, et s'être contentés de tourner, pour ainsi dire, autour de quelques-unes, pour en décrire l'origine, la genèse ou les conséquences. Même en passant ainsi en revue ce qu'ils appellent les *à-côtés* de la vie et de l'œuvre de Flaubert, ils n'ont pas essayé d'en faire une étude systématique et approfondie. Ce sont, comme ils le disent, les hasards des recherches, l'occasion des matériaux accumulés,

¹ Paris, Louis Conard, 1910-1912. Tous nos renvois seront faits d'après cette édition.

qui ont dicté le choix des sujets. Groupés cependant, par ordre chronologique, autour des ouvrages successifs, ces articles laissent une certaine impression d'unité que n'aurait pas eue autrement pareil recueil d'études détachées.

Certains chapitres, ou parties de chapitre, ne représentent guère, il faut l'avouer, qu'un habile remaniement d'éléments déjà connus. Tel un chapitre sur *Flaubert et le théâtre*, tiré presque exclusivement de sa correspondance, de mémoires contemporains et des notes de l'édition Conard. Il contient cependant, sur l'antagonisme fondamental entre l'esthétique de Flaubert et les exigences de la composition dramatique, quelques pages excellentes, se terminant par cette conclusion que le critique aurait pu affirmer avec moins de réserves : En écrivant ces deux comédies [*le Sexe faible* et *le Candidat*] sur le tard de son existence, si Flaubert réalisait un rêve, une hantise de sa jeunesse, peut-être n'avait-il pas alors acquis, et même n'avait-il jamais possédé, au fond, les qualités d'un auteur comique.

Rien de très nouveau non plus dans le quatrième chapitre consacré aux vicissitudes du livret de *Salammbô*, et dont l'apport le plus intéressant est emprunté à un article de M. Georges Dubosc, paru il y a quelques années dans *le Journal de Rouen*.¹ C'est un curieux embryon de scénario préparé par Flaubert lui-même sur la demande de Gautier, qui s'était offert dès la publication du roman pour en tirer un opéra. Le reste du chapitre détaille les péripéties du projet jusqu'à sa complète réalisation entre les mains de Camille Du Locle, mais deux ans après la mort de Flaubert.

Le chapitre III, portant le titre ambitieux de *Salammbô en 1862-1863, devant la critique et dans l'actualité*, n'est, après tout, que le résumé d'une parodie du roman, précédé de la rapide énumération d'une dizaine de comptes rendus, avec quelques citations de caricatures contemporaines. Quant à la parodie, elle fut,

¹ L'auteur de ce chapitre ignorait, semble-t-il, que Spoelberch de Lovenjoul avait déjà publié ce scénario, avec le billet de Flaubert qui l'accompagna, dans son volume *les Lundis d'un chercheur*, Paris, 1894, pp. 77-87. (Il faudrait, donc, ajouter cette mention à la bibliographie de MM. D. et D. et rectifier la note qui suit leur No. 722, vol. II, p. 288.)

d'après M. Descharmes lui-même, une *piètre élucubration* qui *tomba dès les premières représentations, dont Flaubert ne semble même pas avoir connu l'existence éphémère*, et qui . . . ne méritait guère l'honneur que M. Descharmes lui a fait.

Pareil désaccord entre le titre et le contenu du chapitre II sur *les Connaissances médicales de Flaubert*. Ce titre semblerait promettre une analyse des fortes pages médicales de *Madame Bovary*, et de *Bouvard et Pécuchet*, sans parler de *l'Education sentimentale* et d'*Un Cœur simple*. On trouve, au contraire, des extraits de trois études sur la faim et la soif qui auraient pu fournir quelques détails pour le passage du *Défilé de la Hache* dans *Salammbô*. Le critique écarte très justement la première de ces études, mentionnée par Flaubert dans une lettre aux Goncourt²; quant aux deux autres,³ elles offrent des ressemblances fort suggestives avec la fameuse description de Flaubert. Cependant, M. Descharmes s'interdit d'en conclure à quoi que ce soit,⁴ et raille *la critique d'épluchage*, c'est-à-dire la recherche des sources :

Si . . . nous apprenions demain, par une preuve indiscutable, que Flaubert s'est inspiré [des deux susdits ouvrages] en composant ce chapitre, en serions-nous vraiment plus avancés ?

Le critique lui-même fournit involontairement la réfutation de son objection. Il faudrait seulement qu'un esprit plus téméraire veuille *aller plus loin, dégager toutes les conséquences*, et démontrer en quoi consiste la vraie originalité de l'artiste.

Cette extrême prudence, qui se refuse à tirer une conclusion toutes les fois que, faute de preuves indiscutables, il faudrait s'en rapporter

² *Corresp.* III, 312.

³ *Le Naufrage de la frégate "la Méduse,"* par Corréard et Savigny, Paris 1818 et une thèse de doctorat en médecine: *Observations sur les effets de la faim et de la soif éprouvés après le naufrage de la frégate du roi "la Méduse,"* par H. Savigny, Paris 1818.

⁴ Flaubert n'avait-il pas dit lui-même: "Une conclusion n'appartient qu'à Dieu seul," et ailleurs: "Aucun grand génie n'a conclu et aucun grand livre ne conclut" ?

au bon sens et s'en tenir aux probabilités, se montre à un plus haut degré encore dans un chapitre sur *les Ancêtres de "Bouvard et Pécuchet."* Guidés par une indication de Mme Alphonse Daudet, les deux collaborateurs avaient découvert un conte, *les Deux Greffiers*, publié au moins trois fois entre 1841 et 1858, qui offre, pour le fond, des rapprochements significatifs avec le roman posthume de Flaubert. Ils ont ensuite élevé fort ingénieusement tout un échafaudage d'hypothèses plus probables les unes que les autres, pour prouver que ce conte ne put guère ne pas tomber sous les yeux de Flaubert, après quoi ils s'esquivent, en reniant les conclusions de leurs propres arguments :

Mais dans l'entourage de Flaubert on évitait avec soin d'y faire allusion. Et Daudet lui-même aimait le maître d'une affection trop sincère, trop loyale, pour risquer de lui suggérer un tardif scrupule, en lui laissant soupçonner une ressemblance qu'il jugeait purement fortuite. Tenons donc, à son exemple, qu'il s'agit d'une coïncidence curieuse, et rien de plus.

Il est pourtant à craindre que le lecteur, après une si habile exposition des ressemblances et des probabilités, ne se montre moins délicat que Daudet et moins scrupuleux que les auteurs de cet article, et qu'il n'attache à leur excellent travail une autre valeur que celle d'une simple curiosité.

On accordera volontiers un intérêt analogue à la découverte d'une comédie politique antérieure au *Candidat* et basée sur les mêmes données (chapitre VI). Ici cependant, bien que les rapprochements à faire soient du même genre, on peut moins bien établir la probabilité que Flaubert connût cette comédie publiée en 1837, mais qui ne fut jamais représentée. Par conséquent, le critique, et cette fois avec raison, laisse au lecteur le soin de juger "si les ressemblances méritent . . . qu'on tienne la première pièce pour l'origine, même très indirecte et très lointaine, de la seconde."

Les auteurs de ces deux volumes ont été assez heureux pour pouvoir entrer en relations avec les détenteurs de *flaubertiana* inédits, qu'ils ont su mettre en valeur grâce à leurs connaissances spéciales. C'est ainsi qu'ils ont pu donner aux

trois chapitres qui nous restent à considérer, un intérêt qui, sans cela, leur aurait manqué.

Le premier article de la collection, sur "*Madame Bovary*" et son temps, réunit à des citations tirées de la nouvelle édition du roman et de la correspondance du romancier, plusieurs lettres inédites adressées à Flaubert par ses confrères après la publication de son ouvrage, ou lors de son fameux procès pour outrage aux bonnes mœurs. On remarquera particulièrement un curieux reproche de la part de Champfleury, "père du réalisme," qui trouvait certains détails dans *Madame Bovary* trop réalistes; aussi une longue lettre de Sainte-Beuve, qui est presque une ébauche de son compte rendu officiel. La seconde partie de cet article passe en revue la critique contemporaine. Sa documentation est ample, mais l'absence d'idée directrice laisse le lecteur ébloui comme par un effet de kaléidoscope. C'eût été chose facile et instructive que de montrer, dans la corporation des *abrutis* du feuilleton, la division très nette en deux camps qui fut provoquée par l'apparition en bolide de cet ouvrage d'un jeune écrivain inconnu.

On aurait même pu égayer la matière en recueillant quelques spécimens des stupides prophéties, des jugements ineptes émis à cette occasion, une sorte de galerie de ce qu'Aubrey aurait appelé *les niaiseries de la critique*. Pour Durany, par exemple, dans le *Réalisme* du 15 mars 1857, il n'y avait "ni émotion, ni sentiment, ni vie dans ce roman . . . auquel les défauts . . . enlèvent tout intérêt." On en voulut non seulement aux mœurs et à l'observation réaliste, mais aussi, détail curieux, au style du roman, reproche auquel Flaubert se montra singulièrement sensible.⁵ Cuvillier-Fleury, le critique attitré du *Journal des Débats*, dans le numéro du 26 mai 1857, consacra à cette question une étude qui fit les délices du parti orthodoxe. Il trouva le style étrangement mêlé de vulgarité et de prétention, jugement renforcé dans le *Figaro* du 28 juin: "Descriptions à part, son style est indécis, incorrect, vulgaire."⁶ Charles de Mazade, dans la *Revue*

⁵ *Corresp.*, III, 117, 141.

⁶ Cf. aussi *l'Univers* du 26 juin, et *la Gazette de France* du 26 juillet 1857.

des Deux Mondes du 1er mai avait déjà dit: "Style Champfleury (c'est tout dire), commun à plaisir, trivial, sans force ni ampleur, sans grâce et sans finesse."

Malgré ces observations, il est indiscutable que cette collection d'extraits sera intéressante, peut-être même utile. Il y aurait cependant à faire plusieurs rectifications de détail dont voici quelques-unes:

P. 68: "Xavier Aubryet a beau protester [en note: *l'Artiste* du 20 septembre 1857] contre cette incroyable attaque . . . Pontmartin récidive [en note: *l'Assemblée Nationale* du 4 juillet 1857]." Aubryet protesta, en effet, mais après la récidive, lorsque l'article de Pontmartin, déjà publié par *le Correspondant*, numéro du 25 juin 1857, fut reproduit dans *le Spectateur* des 12 et 13 septembre 1857.⁷ (Cf. *Corresp.* III, 135. Voir aussi *Autour de Flaubert*, II, 266.)

P. 86: "J'ai savouré le Cuvillier-Fleury." La mention dans cette lettre (*Corresp.* III, 210) d'un livre et de trois articles publiés tous en octobre 1859 montre que l'allusion ici n'est point à l'article en question (*Journal des Débats*, 14 novembre 1858), mais bien à un compte rendu de Daniel fait pour *les Débats* du 29 octobre 1859.

P. 88: "Hippolyte Rigault, dans ses *Conversations littéraires et morales*, fait en 1859, lui aussi, la comparaison obligée de Fanny et d'Emma." Il la fit même de son vivant (il est mort le 21 décembre 1858), dans le *Journal des Débats* du 5 août 1858.⁸

Le dernier chapitre du tome premier, *Flaubert et ses éditeurs*, tel qu'il parut dans la *Revue d'Histoire littéraire*, avril-juin et juillet-septembre 1911, contenait soixante-quatorze lettres inédites de Flaubert à Georges Charpen-

⁷ Ne faudrait-il pas corriger dans le même sens, tome I, p. 51, note 2, le renvoi à *la causerie du samedi au "National"* (le 14 juillet)? Nous n'avons pu découvrir aucun journal de ce nom existant à cette époque. (Le 14 juillet 1857, d'ailleurs, fut un mardi.)

⁸ Cf. du reste, tome II, p. 266, de l'ouvrage même que nous étudions.

tier. Celles-ci n'ont pas pu être reproduites dans le présent volume, par suite de quoi l'article reste forcément tronqué. La première partie retrace avec force détails l'histoire des rapports de Flaubert avec l'éditeur des trois romans publiés de son vivant. Elle est tirée de la correspondance publiée de l'écrivain, et suivie d'un récit de la rupture finale, éclairci par quelques lettres de Flaubert à Philippe Le-parfait au sujet de la publication des *Dernières Chansons* de Bouilhet. La seconde partie de ce chapitre est plutôt une étude littéraire du *Château des Cœurs*, avec l'histoire anecdotique de sa publication,—le tout précédé d'une fort habile reconstitution du salon de M. et Mme Charpentier, d'après les mémoires des Goncourt et des Daudet. Ce n'est que tout à la fin du chapitre qu'il est, et alors fort peu, question de Flaubert et de son dernier éditeur.

La série de ces études se termine très à propos par un chapitre sur *les Dernières années de Flaubert*. C'est surtout une histoire extrêmement sympathique de son amitié avec Edmond Laporte, sa *sœur de charité*, et de leur long effort commun pour avancer le conte des "deux bonshommes," *Bouvard et Pécuchet*, lequel devait cependant rester inachevé. Ici encore, MM. Descharmes et Dumesnil nous offrent du nouveau, sous la forme de lettres inédites de Flaubert à Laporte, dont ils auraient dépouillé *près de deux cents*. "Billets de trois lignes ou lettres de quatre pages, de tous ces papiers se dégage le même élan de tendresse, la même camaraderie sincère et loyale." Les toutes dernières années de Flaubert sont ensuite racontées à l'aide de lettres en partie inédites, qui montrent l'estime et la tendre affection qu'avaient pour l'écrivain les quelques amis qui devaient lui survivre.

Des trois appendices ajoutés au second volume, le premier, *les Variantes de "Par les Champs et par les Grèves"*, est une ingénieuse étude des trois versions accessibles de cette œuvre de jeunesse. Les conclusions qui en découlent sont inquiétantes pour qui doit travailler sur les textes de Flaubert publiés jusqu'à présent, et indiquent à nouveau le besoin qu'aurait cet écrivain d'un éditeur aussi conscientieux qu'intelligent. Les amateurs de Flaubert

souscriront de tout cœur à la plainte formulée par M. Descharmes :

N'est-il pas en tout cas regrettable que, faute de garanties suffisantes, il puisse subsister, même dans l'édition la plus récente et la plus complète des œuvres de Flaubert, de telles incertitudes ?

Le second appendice, une biographie chronologique, est sans doute le travail de M. Dumesnil, qui en avait publié comme une première ébauche à la fin de sa thèse sur Flaubert.⁹ Ici la biographie est considérablement *revue, augmentée et corrigée*. Il semblerait néanmoins y avoir encore des corrections à opérer, à en juger par les années 1857 à 1862, où se sont glissées, parmi beaucoup d'autres, les erreurs suivantes :¹⁰

1857

“Avril (fin).—*Madame Bovary* paraît.” Cf. vol. I, p. 44: “*Madame Bovary* parut . . . au début d'avril.” Ce fut plutôt entre ces deux dates, peut-être le lundi 13 avril. La dédicace est datée du 12, et le volume est annoncé le 18, dans *le Journal de la Librairie*.¹¹

“Mai.—Il a des velléités de reprendre *la Tentation de Saint Antoine*.” Au contraire, dans le passage en question (*Corresp.* III, 140-141), il répond à Duplan: “Non, mon bon vieux, malgré votre conseil, je ne vais pas abandonner *Carthage* pour reprendre *Saint Antoine*, parce que je ne suis plus dans ce cercle d'idées et qu'il faudrait m'y remettre, ce qui n'est pas pour moi une petite besogne. . . .

⁹ Flaubert, son hérité, son milieu, sa méthode, Paris, 1905.

¹⁰ Nous nous permettons de renvoyer d'avance, pour d'autres corrections, à une étude sur la correspondance de Flaubert de 1857-1862 que nous comptons faire paraître incessamment.

¹¹ Voir aussi tome I, p. 292: “Deux mois s'étaient à peine écoulés que Lévy avait déjà vendu 15,000 exemplaires du roman et commençait un nouveau tirage.” D'après une lettre de Flaubert à Mlle Leroyer de Chantepie (*Corresp.* III, 133), la réimpression du livre fut non seulement commencée, mais faite, vers le 1er juin, c.-à-d. environ six semaines après le premier tirage,—petit détail, mais qui a son importance comme indiquant le succès initial du roman.

Je suis dans *Carthage* et je vais tâcher, au contraire, de m'y enfoncer le plus possible.”

1858

“Mai.—Sousse, Sfax.” Flaubert avait, en effet, projeté d'y aller,¹² mais dut en abandonner l'idée, ainsi qu'il l'annonça à Feydeau le 8 mai:¹³ “Quant à la côte Est, je n'ai ni le temps ni l'argent, hélas !”¹⁴

“Mai 20.—Pour la première fois, dans une lettre à sa nièce, *Salammbô* apparaît comme titre de son roman.” La lettre (*Corresp.* III, 177) est adressée à Jules Duplan.¹⁵

“Juillet.—Il repasse à l'encre ses notes de voyage.” D'après la phrase inscrite à la fin de son cahier, il termina ce travail la *nuit du samedi 12 au dimanche 13 juin, minuit*.¹⁶

“Décembre. Paris. Il assiste aux répétitions d'*Hélène Peyron*.” La première de cette pièce eut lieu le 11 novembre.

“Retour à Croisset.” Ce fut en novembre, vu qu'il ne resta que dix jours à Paris lors de la susdite première représentation.¹⁷

1859

“Juillet.—Cette lettre (*Corresp.* III, 229) doit être placée au moins quatre mois plus tard, puisque Flaubert vient de lire ce soir “*la Femme*” de Michelet, annoncée dans *le Journal de la Librairie* du 26 novembre 1859.

1860

“Avril.—Croisset. Il assiste au mariage de sa nièce Juliette . . . (*Corresp.* III, 238.)” Lire: Avril 17.—Rouen, etc. (*Corresp.* III, 242).

“Décembre.— . . . (*Corresp.* III, 270).” Pourquoi rejeter la date imprimée du 1er janvier 1861, d'autant plus que Flaubert souhaite à Duplan *la bonne année*?

¹² *Corresp.* III, 174.

¹³ *Corresp.* III, 176.

¹⁴ M. Léon Abrami (*Salammbô*, Notes, p. 468), le fait aller aussi à El-Jem, qu'il ne visita point non plus.

¹⁵ Même erreur dans *Salammbô*, Notes, p. 468.

¹⁶ *Notes de Voyages* II, 347. Cf., aussi, *Corresp.* III, 178.

¹⁷ *Corresp.* III, 202.

1861

“Mars.—Croisset. Préparation du chapitre suivant [XIII] . . . (*Corresp.* III, 286 et 290).” La lettre de la page 286 est postérieure à la publication de *Sylvie*, parue à la fin de mai.¹⁸ Quant à celle de la page 290, M. Weil avait déjà fait remarquer qu’elle est de 1859.¹⁹

Mai.—Lecture de *Salammbô* devant les frères de Goncourt, le 6 mai 1861. Le compilateur de cette chronologie voudrait renvoyer cette solennité à un an plus tard. Il se base pour cela sur deux faits: 1° “Les critiques formulées par les Goncourt portent sur l’ensemble du roman,” tandis que, en mai 1861, *Salammbô* n’était point achevée. 2° “On trouve à cette époque [mai 1862] dans la correspondance de Flaubert” une lettre invitant les Goncourt à une *gueulade punique*. Quant au second de ces arguments, on sait ce que vaut le hasard des juxtapositions dans les deux éditions de cette correspondance.

Pour ce qui est des *critiques formulées par les Goncourt*, même si elles ne furent pas ajoutées après coup, elles ne portent que sur le style et l’effet général, et ne prouvent point que l’ouvrage était entièrement fini. Au contraire, les Goncourt disent: “Nous allons de lectures en résumés de morceaux qu’il analyse, et dont quelques-uns ne sont pas complètement terminés.” Or, l’on sait que *Salammbô* fut achevée dès avril 1862, et que, le 20 mai, Flaubert devait tout avoir de sa copiste.²⁰ L’hypothèse du 6 mai 1862 est donc impossible.

“Mai.—Il recommande, à Mme. Cornu, Pouchet père, qui pose sa candidature à l’Académie des Sciences (fauteuil de Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire).” Un tel empressement est fort improbable, ce fauteuil n’étant devenu vacant que par la mort du titulaire, le 10 novembre 1861.

1862

“Avril.—Paris. *Salammbô*, achevée, est donnée à copier.” La lettre citée (*Corresp.* V, 24) nous apprend seulement que, le 19 mai, la

¹⁸ Cf. le *Journal de la Librairie*, 1er juin 1861.

¹⁹ Cf. la *Revue universitaire*, 1902, I, p. 358, n. 6.

²⁰ *Lettres à sa nièce*, p. 24.

copiste n’avait fait que quatre-vingts pages. Il est plus vraisemblable que le manuscrit ne lui fut remis que vers le milieu de mai.²¹

“Août.—Discussions avec Michel Lévy,” etc. Les trois lettres citées (*Corresp.* III, 326, 324, 318) sont du mois de juin 1862.²²

Une copieuse bibliographie, comptant près d’un millier de titres, termine ces deux volumes. Malgré une disposition typographique qui n’est pas des plus heureuses, elle constitue la contribution la plus précieuse de l’ouvrage. Sans en avoir essayé aucun contrôle, nous avons cependant noté quelques omissions sous la rubrique *Madame Bovary (critique)*²³:

Deschamps: Livres français.—*Revue des Deux Mondes*, 15 mai 1857, supplément hors pages: *Librairie et Beaux Arts*, pp. 73–75. (Voir *Corresp.* III, 126, 133, 141, 143.)

Dumas, père: Correspondance et nouvelles diverses.—*Le Monte-Cristo*, 28 mai 1857. (Voir *Corresp.* III, 125.)

Lescure, M. de: Le Roman contemporain. *Madame Bovary*.—*La Gazette de France*, 26 juillet 1857. (Un éreintement à la Cuvillier-Fleury, mais faible.)

Rigault, Hippolyte. Son article du 5 août 1858 fut réimprimé aussi dans ses *Oeuvres complètes*, Paris, 1859, vol. IV, pp. 528–541.

Urbach, Louis: La Quinzaine littéraire.—*Le Courrier de Paris*, 16 mai 1857. (Un des meilleurs articles contemporains, d’une remarquable perspicacité.)

Il doit ressortir de ce qui a été dit plus haut que ces études mettent à la portée du public,

²¹ Cf. aussi, d’ailleurs, *Lettres à sa nièce*, XV.

²² Cf. du reste, *Autour de Flaubert*, I, 300.

²³ Il y aurait aussi à ajouter deux articles sur *Salammbô* que l’on sait exister, mais que nous n’avons pas eu l’occasion de chercher. Le premier, par Louis de Cormenin, est mentionné dans une lettre de Théophile Gautier reproduite par M. Bergerat, *Théophile Gautier*, Paris 1911, p. 298. (Il serait intéressant de savoir si Flaubert eut lieu d’être aussi content de cet article que de celui du même critique sur son premier roman; voir *Corresp.* III, 123, et Du Camp, *Souvenirs littéraires* II, 152–153.) Le second fut l’œuvre d’un critique nommé Silvestre et, d’après Du Camp, piqua vivement Flaubert (*Souvenirs littéraires* II, 343).

sous une forme agréable, bien des renseignements sur la vie et l'œuvre de Flaubert.²⁴ Composées presque toutes comme articles de revue, elles en gardent forcément le caractère un peu superficiel et éphémère, et le ton familier. S'il y en a quelques-unes qu'on ne se serait guère attendu à voir reparaître en volume, d'autres apportent à nos connaissances sur Flaubert une contribution plus importante que les auteurs eux-mêmes ne semblent vouloir admettre.

FREDERICK A. BLOSSOM.

The Johns Hopkins University.

Faust-Studien. Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis Goethes in seiner Dichtung. Von HENRY WOOD. Berlin, Georg Reimer, 1912. vi + 294 pp.

It gives unmixed pleasure to deal with so solid and thoroughly seasoned a work as this, moving in so high an atmosphere of thought, and showing so free and masterly a control of its whole subject. After contemplating the many distressing yeasty ferments for which immature scholars are responsible, there is great consolation in the assurance,

Es gibt zuletzt doch noch e' Wein.

One rests in the comfortable conviction that this is the product of a life-time's concentration upon a work of the deepest human significance. The book has just that characteristic of going to the bottom of things which gains our immediate interest and confidence. It impresses the present reader as a performance which goes back to the ampler traditions of the best American scholarship: it is essentially dignified; it is closely and elegantly reasoned; it wastes no time upon the merely obvious; it is done in large strokes and with a comprehensive outlook, with a full appreciation of the

²⁴ Il y aurait cependant à corriger, pour une réédition, de nombreuses coquilles et même quelques renvois inexacts, tel que la note 2, tome I, page 149.

pulsing life which lies back of the letter; its general spirit is wholly liberal. Along with this, there is a fine perception of most delicate indications and subtle symbols, a tracing of the almost hidden threads in Goethe's weaving.

Equally clear is Professor Wood's supreme piety toward the aged Goethe. He works from the principle that even the most phantasmagoric episode in *Faust* contains some adequate, worthy meaning, which he purposed to chase to its capture, though the hunt should lead around Robin Hood's barn; he will let go of no hint until he has harried it to quiescence.

Nothing less than a deep purpose can be assumed as worthy of Goethe, who came to repudiate without tolerance Rousseau's romantic ideas of an existence of mere contemplation. Every heaven-appointed seer who writes for his own satisfaction must needs be cryptic to his own age,—not intentionally, but in the nature of things. "*Der Dichter*," in Goethe's own words, "*verwandelt das Leben in ein Bild. Die Menge will das Bild wieder zu Stoff erniedrigen.*" Our author is concerned solely with psychical, never with physical identifications, and it must be freely admitted that he plows deep! The book is a monument of sound research: fine-spun, ingenious, recondite, but not deduced from the Inner Consciousness, and by no means limited (as in so much critical work in this field) to autobiographical data supplied by the poet himself. Startling conjectures are backed up by a trooping host of very refractory instances. Professor Wood's cultural stock-in-trade is immeasurably fresher for being derived from a wider field than merely conventional German training, and he draws upon an imposing wealth of material.

From Homer down to Thackeray, and Swedenborg on "Hell."

Philip Sidney and Albertus Magnus; Harnack and *Home Sweet Home*; Burns and Crebillon, Nonnus and Stedman—all must stand and deliver. One is especially glad to find Whitman and Emerson put into connection with general vital problems in the field of German letters.

In view of all that lies back of this work, the present reviewer is free to state that he

chooses not to pass judgment on the main problems which Professor Wood has studied with such profundity and acumen: suffice it to say that all is suggestive and stimulating. In the ultimate interpretation of dark passages in *Faust*, the reviewer is prepared to make the largest admissions in regard to what such lines may contain—provided that the principle be ultimately conceded: Goethe did not "mean" such-and-such things, but he probably had them in mind when writing such-and-such verses.

The upshot of Professor Wood's thoughtful studies is all in the direction of asserting a constructive, progressive, "social" spirit in Goethe's evening of life: he is discovered as a most interested spectator and participant in the great march of events, occupied in expressing these major concerns in the general terms which belong to the equipment of poetry, rather than of history.

As regards the abundant wealth of interpretations and suggestions, we may mention: the theme of the aging poet in the *Vorspiel auf dem Theater* is shown to be closely related to materials in Hans Sachs; Goethe's sonnet-cycle is rescued from a "feministic point of view," and presented in a double sense, as giving a generalization of his whole heart-history, so that the heroine is by no means merely Minna Herzlieb, but, in far larger measure, the fair saint, Renunciation. The cycle, again, is brought into very close relation to the *Ein-schläferungslied* (*Faust*, 1447 ff.). We are offered (pp. 249-250) a very ingenious theory as to the reason for Goethe's reticence on the subject of *Faust* in *Dichtung und Wahrheit*.

A large amount of material is brought forward under the principle of the poet's "fondness for relieving his wrath in dramatic scenes of satiric character." Professor Wood makes it appear that Goethe was engaged to the very end in a war of extinction with Lavaterism, which was not brought to any truce by the tragic passing of that smooth pietist. The iron had entered deeply into Goethe's soul (such dicta, for example, as Lavater's categorical alternative, "Either Christian or Atheist!" never ceased to rankle); the *saeva indignatio* of the poet against the sweetish sensuousness of this

religionist makes, according to Professor Wood, the whole motive of the figure of the witch in her kitchen. This thesis is certainly defended with strong, juridical proofs and argued with subtle ingenuity. We look forward with interest to the redemption of the author's promise that in another division of these studies he "will make the female figure, which Faust discovers in the magic mirror, the subject of more particular observations."

The chief thesis of the latter part of the work is: Goethe, as a Frederician from his boyish days, is dealing with Prussia when treating the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation in the second part of *Faust*. Frederic the Great had stamped his personality into Goethe's soul: a disheartening disillusion occurred when Friedrich Wilhelm II., "*ein verspieltes königliches Leben*," assumed the reins of government. This situation, made more exasperating in Goethe's mind by the influence of Lavaterism in the Prussian court, recurs in *Faust*, and it is this ruler who is excoriated under the guise of the feeble and futile "Emperor."

Sixty pages are devoted to Klinger, who, by his series of philosophical *Faust*-novels entered into competition with Goethe upon his most important field. Professor Wood gives a fascinating study of the collision of these two essentially antipathetic natures. Klinger was the victim of Rousseau, whereas Goethe derived profitable stimulus from him. Klinger had a distracting synchronous leaning toward freedom and orientalism, Goethe loathed arbitrary power. Klinger, with his rationalistic radicalism, wished to destroy the continuity of human history, Goethe, supersensuous in his philosophy of life and nature, was a foe to inorganic change. Klinger is represented as the superserviceable fetcher-and-carrier of despotism. While Professor Wood admits some sterling gifts, he seems to make too much and too little of Klinger, and hardly does full justice to this exponent of "moral energy." His actual career is, in a measure, a refutation of the more compromising charges. Did not, indeed, the late venerable and pious Professor Dr. Hiltz (Germany's Orison Swett Marden), whose genial orthodox-philosophical works en-

joy a sale of hundreds of thousands at the present moment, devote a whole chapter of his recent Practical Philosophy of the Happy Life to a revival of Klinger's *Wie es möglich ist, ohne Intrigue, selbst im beständigen Kampfe mit Schlechten, durch die Welt zu kommen?* Klinger's sincere religiousness, his force of character and moral courage, his quietistic aloofness from the vulgar scramble, have gained him genuine respect from many others than Goethe.

As regards its general logical method, we should be inclined to urge that at times more convincing arguments as to Goethe's knowledge of certain literary facts seem to be indicated as desirable. Similar phenomena are set forth with striking effect—*Parallelen und kein Ende!*—but in some cases the causal relations (perhaps necessarily) are matters of pure inference. With all honor to the solvent acumen and the inexorable cumulative juristic logic of the author, certain connections seem to consist of highly tenuous constructions and unsupported bridge-work; a pregnant phrase from the work itself might be more often applied with profit: “*Ob . . . jedoch . . . ist sehr die Frage.*” Possibly the exigencies of Goethe-philology, like the state of things during Wallenstein's siege of Nuremberg, necessarily compel the foragers to seek for scantier spoils from a territory continuously more remote. One sometimes feels that speculative criticism, having betaken itself from text to Paralipomena, has no recourse left than to proceed from Paralipomena to laundry-lists.

The ingenuity shown in connecting the magic-mirror scene with *Troilus and Cressida* seems of slight value, which reduces itself to zero when presenting the proportion, “*Helena*”: *Cressida* :: *Mephistopheles* : *Pandarus*. Hardly more remunerative is the clothing of the *Meerkater* in the garments of the Inquisitive Traveler of Berlin; the pernicious activities of the *Rosenkreuzer* in Berlin may have remained irritant in Goethe's system up to the very close of his life, but they may also be overworked as a continually recurrent motive.

Of minor matters, hardly calling for attention, may be mentioned the constant printing

of elegiacs without indenting the shorter line—contradictory to the invariable usage of Goethe and Schiller. A number of infelicitous misprints (such as “*Gas*” for *Das* on page 100) appear.¹ One is acquainted with “*Klamer*” or “*Clamor*” Schmidt, but the recurrent form “*Clamer*” has the note of unfamiliarity. Even that tiresome *lectio facilior* “*Erdentagen*” (*Faust* 11583) occurs on page 211; the term *Beth'* (p. 201) belongs to *Faust* 10947 and not to 10945. Piety towards Goethe's verse requires the reading, *einer Ewigkeit* (p. 163) in place of *eine Ewigkeit*, while the rhythm of the hexameter line in Xenion No. 35 (p. 122) is done to death by the omission of the entire word *wahrlich*.

Too high praise cannot be awarded the author for his vigorous, captivating, individual, adequate style, his fitly-chosen words,—more worthy of remark when we remind ourselves that he is working in an alien idiom. The pages coruscate with a diffused wit which glows and lights up the firmament, rather than offers fulminating or pyrotechnic spectacles. The covert allusions and half-concealed side-thrusts are delightfully effective, although the author can also land swinging blows where they will tell most directly. Some of his phrases deserve to live as *ἔπεια πτεροέντα*: “Klinger, the stormy-petrel of Nihilism;” “that moral-hospital of humanity, falsely termed ‘the state of nature’”; “*Es ist gleichsam eine Walpurgisnacht bei Tage;*” “as a unity, the scene in the Witch's Kitchen encounters us in full plastic form, with indignant countenance, a Nemesis carved out of the living rock of German fanaticism.”

We welcome most heartily so vital and important a book, and shall look forward with unusual anticipation to others from the same richly-equipped author: *Vivant sequentes!*

JAMES TAFT HATFIELD.

Northwestern University.

¹ P. 10, 2. and 3. line from bottom; p. 68 (passage for note 2); p. 86, l. 12; p. 108, 2. and 3. l. from bottom; p. 125, last line.

GEOFFREY CHAUCER, ESQUIRE

Chaucer's Official Life, by JAMES Root HULBERT. Menasha, Wis., George Banta Publishing Co., 1912. 75 pp.

Although it is not probable that any large number of new facts about Chaucer will be discovered by his future biographers, much work needs to be done in the way of interpreting correctly the facts we already know. The Chaucer records have too often been studied as if each recorded a unique fact, whereas we ought to study them in their context, so to speak, ascertaining their significance with reference to Chaucer by comparing them with other records of the same kind relating to other men. It is this method of investigation that Dr. Hulbert has pursued in his valuable monograph on Chaucer's official life. The exact scope of the investigation, which, to a great extent, is based upon documents that have never been printed, is best stated in the author's own words:

"I shall attempt first to discover the relative importance of Chaucer's place in the court, and the significance of his varied employments, and secondly to find out the certain connections between Chaucer and John of Gaunt. The means which I shall employ is that of a study of the lives of Chaucer's associates—his fellow esquires, and justices of the peace, and his friends—and a comparison of their careers with that of Chaucer to determine whether or not the grants he received indicate special favor or patronage, and whether it is necessary to assume the patronage of John of Gaunt in particular to explain any step in his career" (p. 5).

Dr. Hulbert's comparison of Chaucer's career with those of his fellow-esquires is a valuable addition to our knowledge of Chaucer's life, in that it makes clear the true significance of facts that have too often been misinterpreted. The annuities Chaucer received are proved to have been no extraordinary favor, but a perfectly normal allowance to esquires of the king. Of the thirty-seven esquires named in the household list of 1368, all but six are shown to have received annuities of varying amounts. The inference to be drawn from this fact is clear; it is not reasonable to assume that, while thirty

of his colleagues received annuities as payment for their performance of the ordinary duties of their office, Chaucer received *his* annuity for writing poetry. The case is similar with reference to Chaucer's controllerships, for Dr. Hulbert shows that some thirteen of Chaucer's fellow-esquires held similar positions at the appointment of the king. He might also have cited from the Household Book of Edward IV the express statement that it was the policy of Edward III to reward the members of his household by such means. The passage is as follows:

"This King [Edward III] appointid of officis outwarde to reward his housold seruices after thair desertes, to be parkers, some forsters, warreners, keepers of manners, Balywikes, Constableships, porterships, Receiuers, Corrodyez, Wardis, marriagis, and many othir things of valure in portis and townes, Citties &c."¹

The wardships that Chaucer received were also among the rewards frequently granted to esquires of the king, as is proved by the parallel cases cited by Dr. Hulbert, as well as by the passage quoted above. Diplomatic commissions of the kind received by Chaucer, although a less normal feature of the esquire's career than annuities and appointments in the civil service, were by no means an extraordinary incident of such a career.² "Apparently," says Dr. Hulbert, "certain individuals were assigned especially to this kind of business and many of these were kept almost constantly engaged in it" (pp. 19, 20). He cites as examples three of Chaucer's colleagues, George Felbrig, Geoffrey Stucle, and Stephen Romylowe, who were repeatedly charged with commissions abroad. It is clear, therefore, that we have no ground for construing such appointments in the case of Chaucer as acts of literary patronage on the part of Edward III or Richard II. Even Chaucer's marriage is paralleled by many other

¹ *Life-Records*, Part II, p. xvi.

² This is proved by the very words of Chaucer's account for expenses on his first journey to Italy, the statement that he received "talia vadia per diem, qualia aliis scutiferis eiusdem status similiter eundo in nuncio Regis ante hec tempora allocata fuerunt." (*Life-Records*, Doc. 72, p. 184.)

marriages between esquires of the king and *damoiselles* of the queen. Dr. Hulbert has proved beyond the possibility of dispute his main thesis, "that Chaucer received no exceptional favors, and that his career was in practically every respect a typical esquire's career" (p. 58).³

The conclusions at which Dr. Hulbert arrives in his discussion of Chaucer's relations with John of Gaunt, however, are less reliable. The author performs a useful service in exploding the time-honored theory that Chaucer's fortunes "rose and fell with those of John of Gaunt," proving conclusively, by an examination of Chaucer's career in comparison with that of John of Gaunt, the baselessness of the assumption that the latter was Chaucer's political patron or backer. It is unfortunate, however, that Dr. Hulbert has combined this argument with a discussion of John of Gaunt's activity as a literary patron of Chaucer. The concluding paragraph of the author's discussion of Chaucer's relations with John of Gaunt is as follows:

"From all these facts, I do not see how it can be maintained that John of Gaunt was Chaucer's 'great patron.' The evidence, so far as I can make out at present, leads one to the conclusion that Chaucer must have received his offices and royal annuities from the king rather than from John of Gaunt, at times when John of Gaunt's influence would have been harmful rather than beneficial,⁴ or when John of Gaunt was not in England to exercise it" (p. 63).

³ In an article entitled "Studies in the Life-Records of Chaucer," *Anglia XXXVII*, pp. 1f., I have stated my reasons for believing that Chaucer's privilege of executing his controllerships by deputy was an uncommon one. It is Dr. Hulbert's opinion, however, that the privilege was one that "could be had almost for the asking" (p. 66), and he cites several examples of other esquires who enjoyed the same privilege. But all of these examples (except that of John Hermesthorpe, which I have discussed in the article mentioned above) are of Edward III's reign, whereas Chaucer's case is of Richard II's reign.

⁴ It is worth noting that Chaucer received permission to appoint a deputy in his controllership of the custom and subsidy at the very time when the king's favorites (with the king himself as an accomplice, according to Walsingham and the continuator of Higden) were plotting against John of Gaunt's life.

The objection that I take to this paragraph is its ambiguous use of the word "patron" in the double sense of "political patron" and "patron of letters." The proof of the proposition that John of Gaunt was not Chaucer's political backer does not prove, or even tend towards proving, that he was not Chaucer's literary patron. Nor could we prove that John of Gaunt was Chaucer's literary patron, on the other hand, by demonstrating that he was his political backer. The two kinds of activity are quite distinct from each other and each must be proved or disproved independently of the other. In our inquiry as to whether John of Gaunt was Chaucer's literary patron, we must set aside such evidence as relates exclusively to John of Gaunt's political patronage of Chaucer. Cleared of irrelevant material, Dr. Hulbert's argument in regard to John of Gaunt's activity as a literary patron of Chaucer is as follows. He begins by pointing out that "we have two pieces of definite evidence of a connection between Chaucer and John of Gaunt; Chaucer's writing (probably shortly after 1369) of the *Book of the Duchess*, and John of Gaunt's grant [to Chaucer] of an annuity of ten pounds in June, 1374" (p. 58). As to the latter fact we may grant (for simplicity) Dr. Hulbert's contention that the annuity to Geoffrey Chaucer "was made merely in order to increase the sum given to Philippa" (p. 59), for John of Gaunt's literary patronage of Chaucer is not dependent upon proving that this grant was a reward for literary labors. As to the *Book of the Duchess*, Dr. Hulbert says that it "does not prove anything with regard to a definite relation; such complimentary poems were commonly written for nobles who were not special patrons of the poets" (p. 58). What meaning are we to attach to the terms "definite relation" and "special patron"?

The plot is said to have been hatched on the night of 14 February, 1385, and the patent permitting Chaucer to employ a deputy is dated 17 February of the same year. See Sydney Armitage-Smith, *John of Gaunt*, p. 289 ff., and the authorities there cited. Dr. Hulbert would doubtless have called attention to this coincidence if he had attached more importance to this incident in Chaucer's career.

Are we to assume that Chaucer wrote the *Book of the Duchess* on a venture, not knowing whether it would be acceptable or not, and that John of Gaunt ignored the work that was presented to him? To assume this would be, as it seems to me, to beg the question; moreover, it is improbable that Chaucer, with his facilities for knowing the duke's tastes, would have expended his labor on a work that was not likely to be acceptable. But on any other assumption than the one I have stated, we must admit that John of Gaunt was, with respect to the *Book of the Duchess*, Chaucer's literary patron. And after all, though the *Book of the Duchess* is our most important evidence of a literary connection between Chaucer and John of Gaunt, it is not our only evidence. We have also Shirley's statement that Chaucer wrote the *Complaint of Mars* at the duke's command.⁵ Moreover, we know that Chaucer planned to use in his *Treatise on the Astrolabe* the kalendar which had been composed in 1386 at the request of John of Gaunt by the Carmelite friar, Nicholas of Lynne.⁶ The eulogistic apostrophe of John of Gaunt's father-in-law, Pedro the Cruel, which Chaucer included among the tragedies of the *Monk's Tale*,⁷ also, leads one to suspect that the poet had in mind as a possible reader of his work the personage to whom, of all men in England, the allusion would have been the most acceptable. These three pieces of evidence ought not to be ignored in an investigation of Chaucer's literary relations with John of Gaunt. To nullify the force of all the evidence for John of Gaunt's literary patronage of Chaucer, more is required than the *a priori* argument Dr. Hulbert uses at the end of his discussion:

⁵ See Shirley's note, as printed by Hammond, p. 384. This statement of Shirley's (made in a note that precedes the poem) is not discredited by the other statement (made in a note at the end of the poem) to the effect that the Mars and Venus of the *Complaint* were the Earl of Huntingdon and Isabel of York. Shirley makes the former statement without qualification; he gives the latter statement merely as a piece of gossip, what "some men sayne."

⁶ See my note on the date of Chaucer's *Astrolabe*, *Modern Philology* X, pp. 204 ff.

⁷ C. T., B. 3565 ff.

"One other suggestion—was John of Gaunt likely to have had enough interest in poetry to patronise a poet? I have found no evidence that he did patronise other poets or artists of any kind, and the impression of his character which a careful scholar like Mr. Trevelyan has gained from a study of his career, is not that he was such a man as would be interested in the arts" (p. 63).⁸

For the question is not, was John of Gaunt interested in poetry in general, or in the arts, but, did he care anything about Chaucer's poetry? The evidence that we have leads us to infer that he did. In protesting against exaggerated and baseless assertions as to John of Gaunt's importance as a literary patron of Chaucer, Dr. Hulbert has done good service, but he goes too far in the direction of minimising the importance (and almost denying the reality) of the duke's literary connections with the author of the *Book of the Duchess*. If he means only to deny that John of Gaunt was Chaucer's *Maeccenas*, we must assent heartily, for medieval patronage of letters seldom took the form of lavish gifts and personal dependence of the poet upon his patron. But if he intends to assert that John of Gaunt gave Chaucer no encouragement whatever in his literary work, but was completely indifferent, or even that his interest in Chaucer's writings is to be limited strictly to a lukewarm and condescending acceptance of the *Book of the Duchess*, we must protest. In regard to the extent of John of Gaunt's interest in Chaucer's work, we must confess our ignorance. The probabilities, however, seem to me to favor the opinion that Chaucer would as a matter of course present some of his later works to the patron for whom he had composed the first important work that we know him to have produced.

Dr. Hulbert shows also a desire to minimise

⁸ Mr. Trevelyan's *England in the Age of Wycliffe*, valuable as it is, gives but an incomplete view of John of Gaunt's character, for its treatment of the general history of the period extends only to the year 1385. A more comprehensive study of the duke's life and character is made by Armitage-Smith in the work previously cited. The latter work leaves one with the impression that a good deal of Chaucer's work might have found a sympathetic reader in John of Gaunt.

Richard II's literary patronage of Chaucer. It is true that "we have no right from the circumstances of his rewards and appointments to suppose that Richard even knew that he [Chaucer] was a poet, certainly none to suppose that Richard enjoyed his poetry and patronized him because of it" (p. 64). But to offer this statement as evidence that Richard was not Chaucer's literary patron is again to confuse the literary patron with the political backer. To prove anything with regard to Richard's literary patronage of Chaucer requires evidence of a different kind, and such evidence is by no means lacking. We know that Chaucer was distinctly a court writer and that Richard liked the poetry of Chaucer's contemporary, Froissart. We know also that Richard was the first English sovereign after the Conquest who is known to have encouraged the writing of poetry in English, and that at least one of Chaucer's works, the *Legend*, was written for Queen Anne. Finally, although Dr. Hulbert has overlooked the fact,⁹ we know that Chaucer addressed to Richard himself at least one poem, *Lack of Steadfastness*. Surely, in the absence of all evidence to the contrary,¹⁰ these facts are sufficient justification for the opinion that Richard II was one of Chaucer's literary patrons.

But this discussion of Chaucer's literary patronage forms, after all, but a very small part of Dr. Hulbert's monograph, a very much smaller part than might be supposed from the emphasis it receives in the present review. Dr. Hulbert's real subject, as the title of his book indicates, is Chaucer's official life. Upon this side of Chaucer's career his investigation throws

⁹ See p. 64.

¹⁰ No conclusive argument against Richard's patronage of Chaucer can be based on the fact that we have no records of rewards given to Chaucer *qua* poet. Too many records have been lost to make the *argumentum a silentio* of much value here. This is strikingly illustrated by the fact that we have no record of any lands held by Chaucer in the county of Kent, although (as Dr. Hulbert says, p. 64) it seems almost certain that he must have had property there. So long as we have good grounds for believing that Chaucer presented books of poetry to Richard and Anne, we need not doubt that he received his reward, even though the Exchequer Rolls furnish no evidence of the fact.

a flood of light. In proving that Chaucer's was a typical esquire's career, Dr. Hulbert has (by implication) refuted the theory that Edward III was Chaucer's literary patron.¹¹ In matters of detail, also, Dr. Hulbert has made some welcome contributions to our knowledge of Chaucer's life. His analysis of the lists of esquires contained in the household accounts provides us with more accurate information as to the members of the household with whom Chaucer was most closely associated (pp. 13-18).¹² The facts cited (p. 33) in regard to Geoffrey Stucle's entrance into the king's household lend some additional probability to the opinion that Chaucer became a member of the household only a short time before the date at which he received the grant of his first annuity, 20 June, 1367.¹³ The account (pp. 50-52) of William de Beauchamp's custody of the estates of the Earl of Pembroke gives new meaning to the record of Chaucer's becoming surety for Beauchamp in 1378. Dr. Hulbert shows (p. 68) that Chaucer's transfer of his annuities was not (as Kirk stated) an extraordinary thing, but in accord with a common practice of the time, and, with much probability, identifies John Scalby as one of the esquires of Richard II. He also (p. 67) identifies the Adam Yardley who succeeded Chaucer as controller of the custom and subsidy in 1386. Finally (p. 67), he identifies Henry Gisors, who succeeded Chaucer as controller of the petty custom, as the person who had formerly been

¹¹ The case of Edward III is quite different from that of John of Gaunt and Richard II, because Chaucer's pensions and appointments were the sole basis of the theory that Edward III was Chaucer's patron. Evidence of a literary connection between Chaucer and Edward III is absolutely lacking. It seems no longer worth while, in view of what Dr. Hulbert has done, to develop in detail the argument I once made against the theory that Edward was Chaucer's patron. An abstract of the argument may be found in the *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, XXVI, pp. xxvi, xxvii.

¹² Some statements on p. 13 in regard to names found in the list of 1369 but not in that of 1368, however, are not quite correct, though the inaccuracies do not appear to affect the main results of the analysis.

¹³ See *Anglia*, XXXVII, pp. 8 ff.

Chaucer's deputy in that office. It is to be regretted that Dr. Hulbert did not print the document relating to Gisors, for the fact is an entirely new one, and the document is needed to supplement those contained in the *Life-Records*.

SAMUEL MOORE.

University of Wisconsin.

The Masters of Modern French Criticism, by IRVING BABBITT. Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1912. xiii + 427 pp.¹

Mr. Irving Babbitt is a representative of a type never common in America, and perhaps rarer to-day than formerly: the professor who is at the same time a man of letters. He is an able stylist, a penetrating critic, and a forceful thinker. His latest book is the first he has written upon an exclusively French theme. As such, it claims and deserves the careful attention of all who are interested in French literature.

The point of view from which the subject is treated is indicated by a motto from Renan: "La critique universelle est le seul caractère qu'on puisse assigner à la pensée délicate, fuyante, insaisissable du XIXe siècle." Mr. Babbitt studies the literary ideas which have dominated the nineteenth century, rather than the individuals who have expressed authoritative judgments upon literary productions. In addition to a brief preface and an extended conclusion, the book contains ten chapters, dealing respectively with Madame de Staël, Joubert, Chateaubriand, The Transition to Sainte-Beuve (Cousin—Villemain—Nisard), Sainte-Beuve (before 1848), Sainte-Beuve (after 1848), Schérer, Taine, Renan, and Brunetière, the chapter last mentioned containing excursions upon Lemaître and Anatole

¹ A number of suggestions made by colleagues have been used in this review. Detailed acknowledgments are omitted as the gentlemen referred to are not responsible for the public expression of their ideas here.

France. From the point of view indicated the choice of authors discussed seems quite judicious. One might perhaps question the inclusion of Joubert, whose fertility and influence were hardly equal to his charm. Sympathy with Joubert's point of view perhaps leads Mr. Babbitt to overestimate the importance of his work. If he does overestimate it, however, he sins in the illustrious company of Sainte-Beuve and Matthew Arnold.

Mr. Babbitt regards his subject from a viewpoint entirely different from that of his two principal predecessors in English, Mr. Dowden² and Mr. Saintsbury,³ who restrict themselves to literary critics in the narrower sense.⁴ Mr. Dowden is sound, solid, and pleasing; he lacks Mr. Babbitt's originality and grasp of general ideas. Mr. Saintsbury's taste is more catholic than Mr. Babbitt's, though still discriminating; his lapses are well known. Mr. Babbitt of course undertakes a much more thorough and detailed study of the theme than his predecessors attempted. Like them, and like most critics, he is probably most successful with the less important writers—Schérer, Nisard, Brunetière. Highly remarkable likewise is the study of Renan, originally published in substantially its present form as an introduction to the *Souvenirs d'enfance et de jeunesse* (Boston, 1902)—one of the few editions of French texts of which American scholarship has a right to be proud.

Mr. Babbitt's book is not concerned entirely with the past. It also endeavors to fix critical standards by which to judge literature. The expediency of this attempt in a work of the kind is open to question. The book also embodies an effort to fix intellectual and moral standards. Many readers will find this second purpose alien to the principal theme. Mr. Bab-

² *Literary Criticism in France*, in *New Studies in Literature* (Boston, 1895), 388-418.

³ Corresponding sections in the *History of Criticism*, Vol. III (New York, 1904). Professor Comfort's careful and unpretending little text-book, *Les Maîtres de la critique littéraire au XIXe siècle* (Boston, 1909), likewise deserves mention.

⁴ Saintsbury (pp. 133, 439-40) denies that either Cousin or Renan was a literary critic, properly speaking.

bitt justifies it half jestingly by the remark that as philosophers of late have been becoming literary, literary men should return the compliment and become philosophers. The real reason for his course, however, lies deeper. He thinks, as does Matthew Arnold, that literature is a criticism of life, and hence concludes that a theory of literature must be at the same time a theory of life. He has propounded such a theory in a system called "humanism," in contradistinction to "naturalism," which he regards as the dominant tendency of the nineteenth century. A large part of the present book is devoted to the discussion of "humanism." Mr. Babbitt's two previous books have made his views fairly familiar. Some of the terminology in the *Masters of Modern French Criticism* is new, but the fundamental ideas are unchanged. Occasionally one notices an attitude more hopeful than the pessimistic but unflinching courage characteristic of the *New Laokoon*.

Whatever one may think of the philosophy set forth—and Mr. Babbitt's strongest opponents cannot deny that his views are interesting and stimulating—one cannot but regret that the author did not disengage the philosophic portions of the book from their literary context and set them forth in a separate work. In such a work he would have found an opportunity, for instance, to make clearer the distinction between what he calls intuitions that are below the intellect, and intuitions that are above it, and to define more precisely his view of the relations between literature and life. One feels somewhat as Sainte-Beuve did (*Lundis*, XIII, 137): "j'aurais préféré que cet esprit si littéraire, laissant tous ces gros et peut-être insolubles problèmes à ses collègues de la philosophie, se bornant à les bien comprendre, ne les eût envisagés que par les ouvertures fréquentes que lui procurait son joli sujet, déjà bien assez spacieux." In the present form of the book, its contents are too philosophic to be literary, and too literary to be philosophical. Mr. Babbitt includes, for example, considerable extracts from his article on Bergson. Interesting as this study is—and it has attracted attention upon two continents

—it has no proper place in the volume. A somewhat similar objection may be made to the careful and extended discussions of the ideas of Emerson and Goethe. Mr. Babbitt himself seems to have felt some doubt on this point, for he is at pains to explain twice (pp. 368, 381) that the inclusion of these studies is entirely appropriate.

That a separation of the literary and philosophic portions of the book is possible and desirable is indicated by the essay on Renan. This study, apparently written before Mr. Babbitt's system had been definitely formulated, takes virtually no dogmatic attitude whatever towards the question of literary or other standards. Consequently, though written from precisely the same point of view as the other chapters, its value as literary criticism is much more likely to be appreciated by those who are not "humanists" in Mr. Babbitt's sense.

The analysis of the literary tendencies of the various critics from the author's distinctive point of view lends to the present work its most remarkable novelty. Though the volume hardly contains an essay as illuminating as that on Lessing in the *New Laokoon*, the study of "Rousseauism" and "Baconianism" as exemplified by Madame de Staël and Sainte-Beuve, Schérer and Taine, frequently yields profitable results. Remarks characterized by real insight are common. They frequently take the form of thumb-nail sketches. Barbey d'Aurevilly, for instance, is well hit off (p. 396) as "a master of flamboyant paradox," and Anatole France (p. 321) as a "humanistic aesthete."⁵

The uniform excellence of the style of the book calls for a repetition of oft-heard encomia. There are numerous passages of really admirable prose, such as the brilliant though biased

⁵Mr. Babbitt suggestively compares M. France with Walter Pater, whom he likewise describes as a "humanistic aesthete." In remarking, however, that "Pater's prose has . . . less purity of contour than M. France's," he hardly brings out sufficiently the difference between M. France's artful simplicity of style and Pater's endless elaborateness. It has also been pointed out that he fails to note the absence of irony in the work of Pater.

characterization of the nineteenth century (p. 188), and the eloquent plea for a cosmopolitanism resting upon a common discipline (pp. 26-30).

As usual, we have an abundant feast of epigram. "The romantic movement . . . is even more a renascence of enthusiasm than a renascence of wonder" (pp. 6-7). Sainte-Beuve is "an epicurean with a Jansenist sensibility" (p. 104). Anatole France "is fond of talking of his 'soul,' when he means in reality his nerves and sensibility" (p. 312). "M. Lemaître is ready to argue a question from two, four or six points of view, avoiding the odd number as savoring too much of a conclusion" (p. 314). ". . . If the eternal Feminine draws us upward, only the eternal Masculine can keep us up" (p. 373). The quotations are likewise happy. We are reminded (p. 347) that Rivarol defines taste as literary honor, that Sainte-Beuve is a "lay confessor" (p. 146), and that Brunetière is "the inventor of militant criticism" (p. 303). One feels occasionally, it is true, that the roast is in danger of being forgotten for the sauce, that, to speak with Madame du Deffand, we have "de l'esprit sur les critiques."

For the last decade or so, as a colleague remarks, Professor Babbitt has been playing Faust to the Wagner of most American students of modern languages. No one can deny that there was more than a little ground for much of his criticism, and beneficial results of it are already apparent. The attack upon "philology" and "mediaevalism" continues with unabated vigor. The assertion that "mediaevalism is not only likely to involve a loss of form, but a loss of ideas" (p. 25) seems rather bold; it certainly cannot be considered proved until Mr. Babbitt adduces a considerable number of "mediaevalists" possessed of ideas and a sense of form who lost them through the influence of their vocation.

Mr. Babbitt's imperfect sympathy with historical studies has left its mark upon his book. Thus the facts of the critics' lives, which would lend unity and coherence to the various aspects of their work, are relegated in briefest outline to a bio-bibliography, in itself excellent, at the

end of the volume. This circumstance accounts in part for the somewhat vague and unsatisfactory impression left by some of the studies.

The disdain for biography referred to is connected with the author's extreme idealism. When he speaks (p. 130) of "relative and contingent truth, the establishing of the facts," one is reminded of Royer-Collard: "Monsieur, il n'y a rien de plus méprisable qu'un fait." Like Guizot, Mr. Babbitt is sometimes in danger of "forcing the infinite and living complexity of the facts into a somewhat arbitrary intellectual mould" (p. 83).

As the preceding remarks indicate, the present review is written from a point of view essentially different from that which the *Masters of Modern French Criticism* represents. It is only fair to Mr. Babbitt to point out that the following criticisms of detail are based upon the idea that, for the understanding and appreciation of literature, the facts of literary history have a greater value than he attributes to them.

In connection with the illuminating remarks on the attitude of the Romantic writers toward genius (pp. 16-7) it might be noted that the word "genius," though occasionally used in its modern sense in the seventeenth century, owes its diffusion in this meaning chiefly to the men of the German *Geniezeit*. One is a little disturbed to find that in the two chapters on Sainte-Beuve no clear distinction is made between the value, as sources of illustrative material, of the works published before and after 1848. It is true that this year is chosen as the dividing line in the titles of the chapters, but the distribution of the material seems to be determined by reasons of outer rather than inner necessity. On p. 100 we are told that "the Comte d'Haussonville who belonged to this [aristocratic] society insinuates that Sainte-Beuve was himself no 'gentleman.'" The Comte d'Haussonville credits the remark, however,⁶ to Victor Cousin, who was the son of a watchmaker, so that the statement can derive little force from the origin of its author. The attribution (p. 100) to the influence of the ladies of the salons of Sainte-Beuve's inclina-

⁶ C.-A. Sainte-Beuve (Paris, 1875), p. 335.

tion after 1831 toward a style of "linked sweetness long-drawn out" seems dubious when we consider the remark made by Juste Olivier in 1830⁷ that Sainte-Beuve showed analogous traits in unconstrained conversation. It is curious that Mr. Babbitt says nothing in this or any other connection of Sainte-Beuve's greatest defect as a writer—his tendency to prolixity.⁸

It is surprising to hear nothing whatever of the Olivier family; there can be little doubt that the Swiss professor and his wife exercised a great influence upon Sainte-Beuve's life and work. In general, the importance of Sainte-Beuve's inclination toward Protestantism at Lausanne seems to be underestimated. The similarity of Arnold's *Dover Beach* to a *pensée* printed in the *Portraits littéraires* (p. 104) has already been pointed out by Professor Harper.⁹ The statement (p. 144) that Sainte-Beuve had "been influential as a naturalist rather than as a humanist" is somewhat surprising. Though it is a little difficult to be quite sure of the sense Mr. Babbitt wishes to give to the word "humanist" in this passage, one would prefer that the assertion had been even more guarded, in view of the numerous traces of Sainte-Beuve's influence upon such writers as Matthew Arnold, Brunetière,¹⁰ and Mr. Babbitt

⁷ Cited by M. Séché in the introduction to Mme. Bertrand's edition of the *Correspondance inédite de Sainte-Beuve avec M. et Mme. Juste Olivier* (Paris, 1904), p. 10.

⁸ Cf., for instance, M. Faguet, in *Petit de Jullenne*, VII, 666.

⁹ *Sainte-Beuve* (New York, 1909), 347-8. My pupil and friend, Mr. J. K. Ditchy, has called my attention to this fact.

¹⁰ It is strange to hear (p. 300) that "the sense of historical development is the main point of contact between Brunetière and Sainte-Beuve," especially as nothing is said in the Brunetière essay of other points of contact. Elsewhere (p. 141) Mr. Babbitt notes that Sainte-Beuve "anticipated" the "Fureur de l'inédit" essay (which opens with a quotation from Sainte-Beuve embodying the idea of the whole study), and in *Literature and the American College* (p. 139) he states that Brunetière "repeats" Sainte-Beuve's attack upon original research. Brunetière's contempt for the Middle Ages is traceable to Sainte-Beuve; his emphasis upon literary tradition is an echo of much in the writings of the author of *Port-Royal*; his use of the "biological

himself.¹¹

In refuting (p. 163) Sainte-Beuve's theory that "Quinze ans d'ordinaire font une carrière," by the examples, among others, of Sainte-Beuve himself and Tennyson, Mr. Babbitt inadvertently fails to note that Sainte-Beuve adds, among other qualifying clauses, "Il est des genres modérés auxquels la vieillesse est surtout propre, les mémoires, les souvenirs, la critique, une poésie qui côtoie la prose. . . ." Similarly, Taine's remark, properly stigmatised (p. 245) as "blackly naturalistic," that "man is mad as the body is sick by nature . . ." is accompanied in the original by a context and a note which render the statement much less violently absurd. The chapter on Brunetière nowhere clearly states Brunetière's attitude toward the question of the relation of literature to morality. To judge from a fairly explicit passage (*Nouvelles questions de critique*, 353-4), Brunetière believed that, although the artist was not a preacher, he was answerable for the possible moral influence of his works, and under an obligation not to depict immoral actions without condemning them. It would have been worth while to note (pp. 384-5) that the campaign against "philology" in France is paralleled in Germany.¹²

analogy" in the theory of the *genres* recalls Sainte-Beuve's attitude towards natural science; and other points of resemblance might be pointed out. Brunetière himself (*Livre d'or de Sainte-Beuve*, p. xxi), in apostrophizing Sainte-Beuve, speaks of his activity "dans la voie où l'on n'avancera qu'en mettant les pieds dans vos traces et où l'on ne vous dépassera qu'en commençant par vous suivre et par vous imiter."

¹¹ Sainte-Beuve frequently advocates the cause of what he calls "l'humanisme;" compare, for example, the plea for "humanism" as opposed to "philology" contained in the *Nouveaux Lundis* (XIII, 297-9), and such remarks as the following (*Causeries du lundi*, III, 16): "Chaque siècle a sa marotte; le nôtre . . . a la marotte humanitaire," as well as that cited by Mr. Babbitt, p. 188, n. 1.

¹² American students will find food for thought in such works as L. Hatvany, *Die Wissenschaft des nicht Wissenswerten* (second edition, Berlin, 1911), as well as in such replies as Immisch, *Das Erbe der Alten* (Berlin, 1911), and Mayne, *Dichtung und Kritik* (Munich, 1912). The influence of Nietzsche, among others, is clearly traceable in the German movement.

The numerous passages translated are chosen with taste and rendered with effect. One is impressed with the contrast between Mr. Babbitt's vigorous and accurate versions and the rather spiritless translations of Professor Dowden. There are occasional inaccuracies, of course. Sainte-Beuve is credited with saying (p. 151) that "this bond between localities and their inhabitants is being forced and exaggerated even to the breaking point"; the original reads: "On a montré et accusé le lien qui les unit jusqu'à le grossir et le forcer," *forcer* being used in the sense of "forcer un talent" rather than in that of "forcer une porte." The young Taine did not believe "that absolute, concatenated, geometrical science *exists*" (p. 251); the French has "est possible." We are told (p. 262) that Renan regards the "slightest bit of scientific research" as more to the purpose than "fifty years of metaphysical meditation;" Renan speaks, however, only of the scientist, "qui, par un essai même très imparfait, contribuerait à la solution de ce problème"—that of the origins of humanity. Renan's ambition is represented as somewhat greater than it really was when we are told (p. 287) that he said: "I compute that I should need five hundred years to complete my Semitic studies, as I have planned them"; he thought it would take him that length of time "pour épuiser le cadre des études sémitiques, comme je les entends." A certain number of the references to pages are inaccurate. There is an excellent *index nominum*; when will the authors of works on literary history make it an invariable habit to add an *index rerum*?

It is natural that in a detailed review in this journal of a volume such as the *Masters of Modern French Criticism* more attention should be given to "the criticism of faults" than to "the criticism of beauties." Mr. Babbitt's book is the most extensive and profound study of the subject in existence. As such, it will be indispensable to serious students, while its spirited style, broad point of view, and suggestive analysis of nineteenth century literature will render it attractive and helpful to the general reader.

University of Illinois. D. S. BLONDHEIM.

CORRESPONDENCE

Ubi sunt—A BELATED POSTSCRIPT

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—Professor Northup's reference in the April Notes to my *Ubi sunt* article of "twenty years syne" (MLN., VIII, 253f.) is doubly suggestive of "les neiges d'antan," as that meagre note was almost my first contribution to the melancholy of nations. Of course I knew then a thousand things which unhappily have long since been forgotten; but, strangely enough, I do not seem to have known that the formula in question is not the exclusive possession of any period or people, but is as universal as the themes of mutability and mischance. An afternoon's ranging through modern English literature, in company with my colleague, Professor W. E. Aiken, reveals the ubiquity of *ubi sunt*.

Northup's apt citation of an Irish "Dialogue with Death" naturally recalls to any lover of Clarence Mangan his spirited rendering of the *Kinkora* of the eleventh-century Mac-Liag—in which the formula is adapted through a dozen stanzas to a score of Hibernian heroes:

"O where, Kinkora! is Brian the Great,
And where is the beauty that once was thine?
O where are the princes and nobles that sate
At the feast in thy halls, and drank the red wine?
Where, O Kinkora?"

The modern Celtic school delights in the *motif*. "Where are now the warring kings?" asks Yeats in a stirring stanza of *The Song of the Happy Shepherd*. "Where is she gone?" is the dirge in *A Broken Song* of Moira O'Neill (*Songs of the Glens of Antrim*). It is needless to multiply instances.

The medieval version of the formula, of which many occurrences have been recorded, apparently lingered on into the modern period. In a song at the close of Ingeland's *Interlude of the Disobedient Child* (Dodsley, II, 320) of about 1550 the familiar rhetorical curiosity is displayed concerning the fate of many biblical and classical worthies, Solomon, Samson,

Absalom, Jonathan, Caesar, Dives, Tully, Aristotle. Strip Lydgate's *Like a Midsomer Rose* of its scanty mysticism, its rather musical repetend—indeed of its slight literary pretension—and there is little to distinguish it from the verses on *Vanity of Vanities* appended by Michael Wigglesworth to the sixth edition of his *Day of Doom* in 1715. The Puritan applies the same formula as the monk and—what is certainly significant—to very similar types of vanished greatness, Scipio, Pompey, Hannibal and Alexander. Interestingly enough, Alexander is dominant in Robert Blair's fine adaptation of the *motif* in *The Grave* (lines 116–130), and in Carlyle's effective use of the device in his chapter on "Natural Supernaturalism" in *Sartor Resartus*.

Thoroughly classical is Sterne's introduction of the formula into *Tristram Shandy* (Book III, chap V.). Indeed, he is writing with his eye on "Servius Sulpicius's consolatory letter to Tully":—"Where is Troy and Mycenae and Thebes and Delos and Persepolis and Agri-gentum," continued my father, taking up his book of post-roads, which he had laid down. "What is become, brother Toby, of Nineveh and Babylon, of Cizicum and Mitylenae?"

A short search furnishes many illustrations of the formula, neither classical nor medieval. It intensifies the horror of the sleep-walking scene in *Macbeth* (V, i, 47–48): "The Thane of Fife had a wife: where is she now?" It adds immeasurably to the tender reverie of Arnold's *Thyrsis*: "Where is the girl . . . Where are the mowers . . . They all are gone and thou art gone as well." It deepens the rich reflectiveness of the *Autumn* ode of Keats: "Where are the songs of Spring? Ay, where are they?" With the formula Byron attains the climax of feeling in his stirring lyric, *The Isles of Greece*; by its means he tumbles into intentional bathos in the eleventh canto of *Don Juan*:

"Where is Napoleon the Grand? God knows.
Where little Castlereagh? The devil can tell."

Then on with these mocking queries for several stanzas (XI, lxxvii–lxxx). And Thackeray muses in his lecture on *George the Third*

over the bygone glories of Carlton House: "Where be the sentries who used to salute as the Royal chariots drove in and out?"

Strange to say, the lighter verse of a more recent time literally revels in the grim *motif*. Dr. Holmes's class-poem of 1852, *Questions and Answers*, is throughout a serio-comic song of *ubi sunt*: "Where are the Marys and Anns and Elizas, / Loving and lovely of yore?" In like mood, Thomas Hood recalls his London schoolmates (*Ode on a Distant Prospect of Clapham Academy*). The formula ranges freely from the society verse of Austin Dobson, "Where is the Pompadour, too? / This was the Pompadour's fan." (*On a Fan*) and of Andrew Lang (*On Life*) through the *Australian Ballads* of Douglas Sladen (*A Voice from the Bush*) and the New England lyrics of Bliss Carman (*Philip Savage* and *The Least Comrade*) to the negro melody of Paul Lawrence Dunbar, "Whah's de da'kies, dem dat used to be a dancin', etc." (*The Deserted Plantation*). But a truce to all this, ere the wearied editor throws down his warden! Yet there is one more noteworthy example, not classical, nor medieval, nor Celtic, which I had almost forgotten—that heart-breaking lament of the nursery:—

"O where, O where has my little dog gone?
* * * * *
O where, O where is he?"

FREDERICK TUPPER.
University of Vermont.

Serouge—Frere en Loi

To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes.

SIRS:—In *MLN.* for March last, Professor Patterson ("Concerning the Type *Beau-Père, Belle-Mère*") pointed out that *serouge* is generally the term used for *beau-frère*. It should have been mentioned that the expression "en loi" was in frequent use to designate marriage-relationship. As early as 1168 there occurs (*Athis et Porphilias*, v. 979) "Ja est ele ma *fame en loi*" (his own wife); and in

Jehan et Blonde d'Oxford (ca. 1270) "estre ensamble *a loi*" (v. 4742) means: *être marié*. It is not strange therefore that we should find "frère en loi." Guillaume de Palerme (ca. 1205) is asked by Alfonse for the hand of his sister Florence; Guillaume is delighted and answers:

Or par serons entier ami
Ami entier et frere en loi.—(v. 8303.)

This locution must have gained rapidly in favor, for it early (1300) passed into English, and remained, as did many other terms or locutions literally translated (How do you do? = O. F. Comment le faites vous? etc.). The French innate tendency toward formulas of politeness has retained the more formal *beau-frère, beau-père, etc.*

J. W. KUHNE.

Miami University.

THE INFLUENCE OF PETRARCH UPON EDWARD COOTE PINKNEY

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—In 1816 William Pinkney, father of Edward, was appointed Minister to the Court of St. Petersburg, with some special mission to be executed at Naples. It was in that year that Edward, at the age of fourteen, entered the U. S. Navy, from which he resigned in 1822, in his twentieth year. Some portion of that six years was spent cruising in the Mediterranean Sea.

On his way to St. Petersburg, by way of Naples, William Pinkney said to a friend, "I want to see Italy. The orators of Britain I have heard, but I want to visit the classic lands of Italy, the study of whose poetry and eloquence is the charm of my life." Through his own eager eyes, then, and possibly through the eyes of his father, Edward Pinkney saw and learned to love Italy.

In *A Health*, *The Indian's Bride*, and some of Pinkney's shorter poems there are striking similarities to Petrarch. Pinkney may not

have been able to read Italian, but he could have become familiar with Petrarch's poems through *Tottel's Miscellany*. The Italian spirit and the Petrarch-touch are unmistakable. Note the following:

" Exchanging lustre with the sun,
A part of day she strays—"
—*The Indian Bride*, 15, 16.

" Uno spirto celeste, un vivo Sole
Fu quel ch'i' vidi . . . "

—Sonetto LXI—69, lines 12, 13. (From *Le Rime di Francesco Petrarca*, . . . di Giuseppe Rigutini, Milano, 1896, p. 93. Hereafter referred to as Rigutini.)

" Ch' è sola un Sol, non pur agli occhi miei,
Ma al mondo cieco, . . . "

—Sonetto CXC—210, lines 3, 4. Rigutini, p. 221.

" Cosi costei, ch'è tra le donne un Sole,"

—Sonetto VIII—9, line 10. Rigutini, p. 8.

" Una donna più bella assai che'l Sole."

—Canzone III—24, line 1. Rigutini, p. 368.

" A glancing, living, human smile,

On nature's face she plays."—*Id.* 17, 18.

" E l'immagini lor son sì cosparte,
Che volver non mi posso ov'io non veggia
O quella o simil, indi accesa, luce."

—Sonetto LXXI—84, lines 9–11. Rigutini, p. 105.

[Her eyes shone upon his heart]

" As shines on snow the fervid sun."

—*To* —; 'Twas eve, etc.

" Che mi struggon così, come 'l Sol neve."

—Sestina II—Canzone 7, line 21. Rigutini, p. 30.

" Look out upon the stars, my love,
And shame them with thine eyes."

—*Serenade*, 1, 2.

" Non vidi mai dopo notturna pioggia
Gir per l'aere sereno stelle erranti,
E fiammeggiar fra la rugiada e 'l gelo,
Ch'i' non avessi i begli occhi davanti,
Ove la stanca mia vita s'appoggia,
Qual io gli vidi all' ombra d'un bel velo."

—Canzone XII—28, lines 57–62. Rigutini, p. 125.

" A woman, of her gentle sex the seeming paragon."

—*A Health*, 2.

"Che sol sè stessa, e null'altra simiglia."
—Sonetto CIX—127, line 4. Rigutini, p. 152.

"Ch'ogni altra mi parea d'onor men degna."
—Madrigale II—Canzone 12, line 3. Rigutini, p. 53.

WIGHTMAN F. MELTON.

Emory College.

BRIEF MENTION

With the present issue Professor Collitz retires from the editorial board of *Modern Language Notes*. His withdrawal, which he has already postponed far beyond the time when he first proposed it, is due to the pressure of important investigations in which he is engaged, and of editorial work in connection with *Hesperia*. While his resignation is a cause of keen regret, we are fortunate in the promise of his unabated interest in the journal, not alone as a contributor, but as a friend and counsellor in the many questions where his advice and experience will continue to be invaluable.

We are glad to be able to announce that Professor Bert J. Vos, of Indiana University, has consented to take charge of the department of German. Directions concerning material for that department will be found on the second cover-page of this number.

The edition by A. Marinoni of *Selections from Carducci* (New York: Jenkins, 1913) is all the more welcome since, of Italian authors of the first importance, Carducci is the least read by English-speaking people. Of the prose extracts in this edition, the student will probably find the long paragraphs and sentences of two of the selections on literary subjects forbidding. The prose might have been reduced in favor of the poetry, and lightened advantageously with extracts on less important subjects, as was done in the *Antologia Carducciana* of Mazzoni and Picciola. The poetical part is wisely chosen chiefly from the *Odi Barberane* and the *Rime Nuove*. *Jaufrè Rudel* fails to illustrate what is said (p. xii) of the super-excellence of the *Rime e Ritmi*, and one regrets that there is no extract from the famous *Alle Fonti del Clitumno*. The notes,—mostly useful explanations of historical and literary allusions,—are not too many. One misses explanations of poetical archaisms as "balzar nel buio," "pareano aspettare anche" (p. 77); *affrettasi*

(p. 83), and writings such as "ne l'infinito" (p. 87). Notes on *David* (p. 5), *Cervantes* (p. 35), *Lucifer* (p. 49) seem hardly necessary. What is said about versification (pp. 64-68) is generally sufficient. The *versi brevi* (especially the *settenario*) need more than "one rhythmic accent" (p. 66). Only one form of *novenario* is given. The *Introduction*, though orderly and comprehensive, is often ineffective or obscure, partly because of those difficulties which hamper all foreigners, even when they know English well. The English *secular* (p. viii) and *genial* (p. xiii) are mistaken for equivalents of the Italian *secolare* and *geniale* (cf. also *exposing* for *esponendo*, p. 32, n. 2). This part would gain by more history and less praise. The good vocabulary ("sickly" does not interpret *scrofoloso*), adds practical value to the work, which was worth attempting, and will be well worth using.

J. E. S.

The Bartsch-Wiese *Chrestomathie de l'ancien français*, which started a half century ago, appears in its eleventh edition (Leipzig, Vogel, 1913) after an interval of only a little over two years. The use of new plates has permitted the substitution of more agreeable type, but only a few modifications in the text were needed, so that it has been possible to retain the pagination of the ninth and tenth editions. The most substantial alterations are in the index of proper names, where a number of the statements have been rendered more detailed or more specific. It is an ever useful volume of selections which maintains its reputation as one of the best books of its type.

Another important handbook for the student of medieval French, Voretzsch's *Einführung in das Studium der altfranzösischen Literatur*, has also recently appeared in a new edition (2nd edition, Halle, Niemeyer, 1913). In its method of arrangement and discussion it is better adapted to the uses of the beginner than Paris' manual, and the opportunity furnished in successive editions to embody the results of later research makes it a general reference book useful as a supplement to Gröber's treatment of Old French literature in the *Grundriss*. The discussion of the epic in the new edition shows the influence of Mr. Bédier's work almost solely in modifications of phraseology—a conservatism which is equally exemplified in the unaltered bibliographical data (p. 50) regarding American periodical publications.